Vol. LXXIII, No. 1 July, 1925

The Ecclesiastical Review

A Monthly Publication for the Clergy Cum Approbatione Superiorum

BX
801
.E17
v.73

CONTENTS

THE SOCIAL REIGN OF JESUS CHRIST 1
The Rev. JAMES H. RYAN, Ph.D., S.T.D., Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

THE PRINCIPLE OF AUTHORITY IN THE CHURCH 10
The Very Rev. Father CUTHBERT, O.S.F.C., Oxford, England.

THE LIBRARY OF A PRIEST 26
The Rev. THOMAS A. HUGHES, S.J., Rome, Italy.

FATHER JUVENIS INVESTS IN RADIO 47
PASTOR ANTIQUUS.

CAN MARRIAGE OF TWO DOUBTFULLY BAPTIZED NON-CATHOLICS BE DISSOLVED "QUOAD VINCULUM"? 62
The Rev. Dom. PRUMMER, O.P., University of Fribourg, Switzerland.

PAULINE PRIVILEGE AND DOUBTFUL BAPTISM 65
The Very Rev. H. A. AYRINHAC, S.S., D.D., LL.D., Menlo Park, California.

DID CHRIST EAT THE PASCH? 72
MONACHUS BENEDICTINUS

THE CHURCH AND NON-CATHOLIC MARRIAGES 78

RECENT BIBLE STUDY 80

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

PUBLICATION OFFICE
111-113 E. Chestnut Street
Lancaster, Pa.

THE DOLPHIN PRESS
Philadelphia

GENERAL OFFICES
1305 Arch Street
Philadelphia, Pa.

Copyright, 1925: American Ecclesiastical Review—The Dolphin Press

Subscription Price: United States and Canada, $4.00—Foreign Postage, $1.00 additional

Sole Agents { Great Britain: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 8 Paternoster Row, London, E. C., 4
Ireland: Catholic Truth Society of Ireland, 24 Upper O'Connell St., Dublin
Australia: W. P. Linehan, 8 Bourke St., Melbourne

Entered, 2 July, 1924, as Second Class Matter, Post Office at Lancaster, Pa., under Act of 3 March, 1879

BROTHERHOOD CORPORATION

L. L. FARRELL (President)

Vineyards:

Washingtonville, Est. 1839
Livermore, California

Address all communications to:

New York Office
71 Barclay Street

The Brotherhood is one of the oldest and largest Altar wine houses in this country. We allow no dealers to handle our Altar wines, all shipments being made direct to the Reverend Clergy from our vineyards at Washingtonville, New York.

Mr. L. L. Farrell, the President, has devoted his entire life to the Altar wine industry, and all shipments are made under his personal supervision.

Requests for price lists and application blanks will have prompt attention

MANY churches have windows that cannot be seen except when the sun shines or when it is at the exact height to flood the windows.

This is unfair to the window, its donor or its artist. It is also unfair to those of your congregation who love colored windows.

We have been unusually successful in the artificial illumination of colored windows.

We have a catalog that tells what we have done and suggests what we could do for you.

A post card will bring it with complete information.

I. P. FRINK Inc.

24th Street and 10th Ave., New York

Representatives in Principal Cities.

CONTENTS CONTINUED

ANALECTA

S. Poenitentiaria Apostolica (Sectio de Indulgentiis): Decretum: de Normis in concedenda et lucranda Indulgentia Portiunculae... 58

Diarium Romanae Curiae: List of Recent Pontifical Appointments... 61

STUDIES AND CONFERENCES

Our Analecta—Roman Documents for the Month... 62

Can Marriage of Two Doubtfully Baptized Non-Catholics be Dissolved "Quoad Vinculum"? (*The Rev. Dom. Prümmer, O.P., University of Fribourg, Switzerland*)... 62

Pauline Privilege and Doubtful Baptism. (*The Very Rev. H. A. Ayrinhac, S.S., D.D., LL.D., Menlo Park, Calif.*)... 65

Did Christ Eat the Pasch? (*Monachus Benedictinus*)... 72

The Church and Non-Catholic Marriages... 78

Mass Stipend from Persons in Debt... 80

The Conclusion of the "Veni Creator"... 81

Rules for the Book-Buyer... 82

Funerals of Children... 82

ECCLESIASTICAL LIBRARY TABLE:

Recent Bible Study: The Old Testament... 83

CRITICISMS AND NOTES:

Metzler: Petrus Canisius, Deutschland's Zweiter Apostel... 91

Barrett: The New Psychology... 94

D'Agnel-d'Espiney: Psychologie et Psychotherapie Educatives... 94

Maritain: Reflexions sur l'Intelligence et sur sa Vie Propre... 94

Wernz: Jus Canonicum... 97

Farrugia: De Matrimonio et Causis Matrimonialibus... 99

Streeter: The Four Gospels... 99

Bevenot: Pagan and Christian Rule... 101

Rickaby: Readings from St. Augustine on the Psalms... 104

LITERARY CHAT... 105

BOOKS RECEIVED... 109

ESSENTIALIA PHILOSOPHIAE

Quae in Usum Incipientium Digessit

FRANCISCUS P. SIEGFRIED

in Seminario S. Caroli Borromaei Philadelphiense Professor

Pocket Summary of Catholic Philosophy, giving the essentials of **Logic, Ontology, Cosmology, Psychology, Theodicy, Ethics,** briefly, clearly, in form of question and answer.

All set forth in graphic survey. For students of Philosophy in the Seminary and for maturer students who desire to make a rapid review of their Philosophy.

$1.80 a copy postpaid

American Ecclesiastical Review - - - 1305 Arch Street, Philadelphia

Firms with Episcopal Authorization to Handle Sacred Vessels to Repair Them

BALTIMORE:	JOHN MURPHY CO., Park Avenue and Clay Street.
BOSTON:	BIGELOW KENNARD & CO., 511 Washington Street. THOS. J. FLYNN & CO., 62-64 Essex Street. MATTHEW F. SHEEHAN COMPANY, 17 and 19 Beach St. PATRICK J. GILL, 387 Washington Street.
CHICAGO:	BENZIGER BROTHERS, 205-207 W. Washington Street. (Factory in De Kalb Avenue and Rockwell Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.) JOHN P. DALEIDEN CO., 1530-32 Sedgwick Street. ECCLESIASTICAL GOODS CO., 984 Milwaukee Ave. D. B. HANSEN & SONS, 27 N. Franklin Street. EDWARD J. KOENIG, 1536 North Clark Street. MATRE AND COMPANY, 76 W. Lake Street. SPAULDING & CO., Michigan Avenue and Van Buren St.
CINCINNATI:	BENZIGER BROTHERS, 343 Main Street. (Factory in De Kalb Avenue and Rockwell Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.) FR. PUSTET CO., 436 Main Street.
CLEVELAND:	NORTHERN OHIO PLATING WORKS, 1501 Columbus Road.
DENVER:	JAMES CLARKE CHURCH GOODS HOUSE, 1638-40 Tremont St.
LOS ANGELES:	EDWARD J. KOENIG, 1107 South Main Street.
MILWAUKEE:	BERGS MANUFACTURING CO., 483-485 Twenty-seventh Street. DIEDERICH-SCHAEFER CO., 413 Broadway. A. WERNER, 649 E. Water Street.
NEW YORK:	BENZIGER BROTHERS, 36-38 Barclay Street. (Factory in De Kalb Avenue and Rockwell Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.) BLASE BENZIGER & CO., INCORPORATED, 98-100 Park Place. THE FEELEY CO., 10 W. 50th Street. THE GORHAM COMPANY, 5th Avenue and 47th Street. P. J. KENEDY & SONS, 44 Barclay Street. FR. PUSTET CO., 52 Barclay Street.
OMAHA:	KOLEY AND SON, 2910 Farnam Street.
PHILADELPHIA:	H. L. KILNER, & CO., 1708 Market Street. J. J. McDERMOTT, Room 818, 1011 Chestnut Street. LOUIS J. MEYER, INCORPORATED, 804 Walnut Street. F. C. PEQUIGNOT, 1331 Walnut Street. HERMAN J. WOLF, 539-543 W. Huntingdon Street. WRIGHT MANUFACTURING CO., 127-35 Master Street.
PITTSBURGH:	E. J. LETZKUS, 2006 Jenkins Arcade.
PROVIDENCE:	W. J. FEELEY CO., 139 Baker St. THE GORHAM COMPANY, Elmwood. W. J. SULLIVAN CO., 96 Jefferson Street.
SEATTLE:	THE KAUFER CO., 1607 Fourth Avenue.
ST. LOUIS:	B. HERDER BOOK CO., 17 South Broadway. MUELLER PLATING CO., 920 Pine St., Imperial Bldg.
ST. PAUL:	E. M. LOHMANN CO., 385 St. Peter St.

THE
ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

EIGHTH SERIES.—VOL. II.—(LXXIII).—JULY, 1925.—NO. 1.

THE SOCIAL REIGN OF JESUS CHRIST.

IN his first Encyclical (*Ubi Arcano Dei*) to the Catholic world, Pope Pius XI sketched in a masterly fashion the origin of the evils which afflict present-day society, and outlined in the most authoritative manner the remedies which must be applied if our present civilization is to endure and to continue to benefit mankind. The commanding note of this great utterance is its insistence on the supremacy of Jesus Christ as the source and end of every social good. The Holy Father did not utter a new doctrine. He only reiterated what has been the outstanding feature of every encyclical letter since Leo XIII. It was the great Leo who, in a series of profound papers, definitely fixed the attitude of the Church on such modern problems as the seat of social authority, the rights of property, the duties of capital and labor, and the place of the state in modern society. Since his day, the social orientation of the Church has been most marked, to the benefit of humanity and to the marvelous upbuilding of the Church itself.

Pope Pius XI finds the world still at war, despite the fact that a formal peace between the nations has been signed. And the terrible effects of the great struggle persist and shall probably continue to influence mankind for many a long year. Hatred, jealousy, national rivalries separate the nations. Within the different nations, party struggles divide the people and often result in the gravest excesses. Intermingled with political struggles, and often the cause of the same, there exists an industrial warfare which has resulted in countless social evils and has even dared to penetrate the peaceful seclusion of

family life itself, and threatens it with disruption. Under such conditions it would be foolhardy to expect that the Church too should not suffer, and quite seriously. Not only has religious indifference crept into the lives of thousands; a positive assault has taken place on religion itself, the effect of which has been to weaken considerably its public and private influence. "Instead of the serene tranquility of order which is the first and inherent good result of peace," writes His Holiness, "restlessness and turbulence reign; instead of certain trust, the growing uncertainty and the fear of ever-threatening dangers; instead of regular and fruitful work, the arrest or cooling down of social activity with the vices and unhappiness of unemployment and idleness. Industries suffer, business is lessened and delayed, and serene worship is made always more difficult, and with worship the progress of the sciences, letters and art. Consequently Christian civilization is endangered with the inevitable sequel of painful retrogression of mankind, a retrogression toward decadence, not only economic and material, but intellectual, moral, and religious; a true reduction of society to barbarism."

To meet this menacing situation, the Pope calls back the nations to their allegiance to Christ, their only King and Lord. Christ alone is the way, the truth, and the life. As long as men, either individuals or peoples, continue to ignore His supremacy, so long shall strife, warfare, and death stalk through the world. But "when governments and nations will follow in their collective acts, be they internal or international relations, the dictates of conscience which the teachings, precepts, and examples of Jesus Christ propose to and impose on every man, then only can they trust one another, and have faith in the pacific settlement of the difficulties and controversies which might arise from different views and opposite interests." To attain such an end, Pius XI unites the underlying motto and driving force of the pontificate of his predecessor, Pius X, "to restore all things in Christ", with his own program, "the peace of Christ in the reign of Christ". In a word, the Holy Father calls upon us all to recognize explicitly the Kingship of Jesus Christ and to live as convinced and faithful subjects of His Kingdom, for only in doing so shall justice and peace be brought back again to this distracted world.

The thought of the Church which, during the last half century, has been turned very definitely in the direction of peace, social betterment, and the reign of law and order amongst men, has sought for a concrete expression of this belief and has found it in the Social Reign of the Sacred Heart. This idea seems to embody best the faith and aspirations of the thousands who are laboring to-day to make the world a better place to live in, as well as to express concretely the ideal of Christian belief and action as it is interpreted in the light of modern conditions. For no one can deny that the great industrial revolution, which began in the early nineteenth century, changed radically not only the material conditions of life but also gave rise to no less serious spiritual problems. The Church, face to face with the problems brought about by the changed conditions of living, by the gradual spread of democratic ideals, by the universal participation of all classes of men in the affairs of their own governments, looked for an ideal which would synthesize her faith, and found it in her belief, as old as the Gospels themselves, that Jesus Christ is the King of the human race, and that in submission to His authority can be found the panacea for every ill. Impelled by this idea, as early as June, 1899, five Cardinals, amongst whom was Cardinal Sarto, the future saintly Pius X, and 89 archbishops of Italy and South America laid before Pope Leo XIII their request that the Church establish a feast in honor of Jesus Christ, the Universal King of Society. The Pope was visibly impressed. He received the petition most favorably and had it sent to the Sacred Congregation of Rites for study and investigation.

The idea of a feast which would exalt the Royal Person of Jesus Christ was presented also to Popes Pius X and Benedict XV. Both pontiffs were in entire sympathy with the movement and encouraged its growth. The disturbances of the great war, however, put an end to the thought of the new feast. After the close of the war, the idea was revived and presented to the now reigning Pius XI. Cardinal Laurenti, a patron of the Society of the Social Reign of Jesus Christ, under the auspices of which the demand for the feast is gaining great momentum, presented to the Pope a memorial signed by Cardinal Dubois praying for the establishment of the new feast. Along with the letter was included the text of the Mass and Office of

the feast. The Pope expressed himself as highly pleased with the idea. A feast in honor of the Social Reign of Christ appears to him not only a beautiful idea, but one very appropriate to the times in which we live and to the underlying motives which guide him in the work of his pontificate. However, the Holy Father cannot be expected to decree the feast until there has developed a veritable world-wide demand for it. The Holy See, convinced though it be of the timeliness of such a move, could scarcely be expected in a grave matter of this character simply to impose its will upon the Church. Therefore, education is needed as a preparatory step to the settlement of the question.

That the desire for the new feast is widespread is evident from the ever-increasing number of demands being made on all sides for its establishment. Since 1914, the Social Kingdom of Christ has been the principal theme for discussion at every Eucharistic Congress. At the great Congress held in Lourdes in 1914, under the presidency of a Papal Legate, and attended by 189 members of the Hierarchy, a formal resolution favoring the feast was voted. Again, at Paray-le-Monial in 1921, and in Paris in 1923, a formal and unanimous vote was cast and transmitted to Rome. Numerous organizations of men and women, the world over, have already approved the idea. At the present time, no less than 24 cardinals and 528 archbishops and bishops, many of them from the United States, together with the Superior Generals of all the important religious orders and congregations, have signed the formal petition asking the Holy See to establish a feast in honor of Jesus Christ, the Universal King of Society. There can be no question, therefore, of the rising tide of popular approval. If this approval should continue to grow in the near future in anything like the ratio it has during the last three years, the time is fast approaching when the Universal Church will have signified its approval of the feast. When this time arrives, there can be no doubt of what the action of the Holy Father shall be.

A new feast is never established by the Church until after she has investigated minutely all the dogmatic implications contained in the idea itself. There is an old saying, "lex credendi legem statuit supplicandi", which has always been the guide in the Church's public worship. The Church never

forgets the intimate relation which exists between the law of prayer and the canons of belief. That the belief in the Social Kingship of Jesus Christ is in perfect accord with the exigencies of Catholic dogma is apparent from even a superficial and cursory examination of the Sacred Scriptures and the traditions of the Church, the twofold source of Catholic belief. In the very beginning of Genesis we are told that God created all things by His divine fiat. "He spoke, and it was done." God created all things by the power of His Word. This Word was from the beginning: this Word is God. In time, this "Word became flesh and dwelt amongst us". As one with God, the Creator and Ruler of all things, Christ is King and Master of all. The Psalmist acknowledged this Kingship of Christ when he wrote, "For the kingdom is the Lord's: and he shall have dominion over the nations."[1] And St. John in the Apocalypse writes, "Great and wonderful are thy works, O Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, O King of Ages."[2] That Christ is a King, no one can doubt. But of what nation is He the King? King David answered this question when he wrote, "All kings of the earth shall adore him: all nations shall serve him."[3] And in Ps. 144 is drawn a picture of the perfect King, good, merciful, the exemplar and paragon of royalty. In the New Testament we have constant references to the Kingdom of God. When Pilate asked Jesus if he were a King, our Lord replied: "Thou sayest it." Not only as God, but as man He is the Universal King of Society, *rex regum Dominus dominantium.* And though the Jews repudiated His royal claims and wished no other king but Caesar, yet He remained and still remains the King of Mankind, *Christum regem dominantem gentibus.*

The liturgy of the Church in no uncertain terms proclaims Christ the King of all nations. Again and again He is called the King "Who lives and reigns world without end, Amen." But Christ is King in a special manner of His Church here on earth, of which He is the Head and whose visible representative is the successor of St. Peter, the Bishop of Rome. To honor our Lord, therefore, as King is to make known to the whole

[1] Ps. 21:29.
[2] Apoc. 15:3.
[3] Ps. 71:11.

world not only the fact of His royalty, but the extent as well of this kingly power which is coterminous with the Universal Church, the Church militant, suffering, and triumphant.

There does not seem, then, to be any doubt that the establishment of a feast to honor the Social Reign of the Sacred Heart is consonant with the dictates of Catholic dogma and in entire harmony with the liturgical life of the Church. The Sacred Congregation of Rites, however, never approves a feast unless the object of the same is concrete. It is for this reason that the postulators of a feast to honor the Social Reign of the Sacred Heart have decided to ask that the feast be named in honor of Jesus Christ, the Universal King of Society. In this way, both the abstract idea underlying the belief in the Social Kingship of Christ and the concrete act of devotion which would be directed toward the Person of our Blessed Lord are synthesized in a marvelous expression of public belief and worship.

The committee in charge of the movement has asked that, if the feast be established, it be celebrated on the Sunday following the Feast of the Sacred Heart. There are many cogent reasons for assigning it to such a date. In the first place, working people would be able to celebrate the day if a Sunday were chosen. And as this is a feast which would make a very special appeal to them, it appears most wise to ask that it be fixed for a Sunday instead of a weekday. Again, the Feast of Jesus Christ, Universal King of Society, sums up in itself all our beliefs and aspirations toward Him who though God did not disdain to become man. Coming thus after the Feast of the Sacred Heart, it would be a fitting close as well as an epitome of the already established feasts which honor the mortal life of Christ. Finally, the Sunday after the Feast of the Sacred Heart would definitely fix in the popular mind the very close relations which exist between the new feast and that of Corpus Christi, for it is by means of His Love visibly existing in the Holy Eucharist that Jesus reigns over all men.

It must appear clear to every one that the Church would not establish a new feast, no matter how beautiful or how dogmatically correct the idea may be, unless it were assured that very definite and tangible consequences for the faithful follow upon such an institution. No great thought is required to appreciate the tremendous consequences, both religious and

social, which would inevitably follow in the wake of a feast to honor the Social Reign of Jesus Christ. There immediately comes to mind, as one of the most important and needed results of such a feast, the great public act of reparation to Christ, the Immortal King of the Ages, which would necessarily ensue. Certainly at no time in the history of the Church, with the possible exception of the time when Arianism was rampant in the world, was it more necessary to insist publicly on the divinity of Christ. Not only has theological modernism made of Christ a mere man. The net result of Protestant teaching has been to reduce the divinity of Christ to a mere shadow, where it is not denied outright. Present-day philosophy is openly antagonistic to the divine claims of Jesus, and modern science views this dogma as a mere medieval superstition. We need not insist on the great number of avowed atheists who, like the Communists of Russia, are doing all in their power to erase the very name of Christ from the minds and hearts of men. Certainly, considering the chaos which exists to-day in every field of belief, it is the duty of all Christians not only to defend the divinity of Christ but to make public reparation as far as it is possible for the innumerable insults offered to the Sacred Person of our Lord. What a tremendous prayer, indeed, would arise to the heavenly throne of our King and Lord if, all over the world, on a set day, every Catholic should publicly proclaim his belief in the Kingship of Jesus Christ!

Again, a feast to honor the Reign of Christ amongst us would undoubtedly impress on thousands, in a more effective manner than any other conceivable agency, the foundation truth of Catholic dogma, the divinity of Jesus Christ. Men are so apt, even after they have learned, to forget the vital significance of the cardinal dogmas of our holy religion. Occupied with the daily struggle to obtain a living, they fail to appreciate the truth that it is not by bread alone that man lives. Suppose, therefore, that the Universal Church should celebrate on a specific date this great feast, and we can readily see what splendid consequences it would have for the faith of our people. They would again hear the truth that Christ is both God and man; their faith in Him would be revivified, their love of Him would be strengthened.

The social consequences of such a feast are scarcely less important than the religious consequences. If there is dogmatic chaos outside the Church, there is no less anarchy in our social, economic, and political life. It is quite unnecessary to recite the social doctrines prevailing to-day to which no Christian can possibly subscribe. Along with these beliefs, exists a great number of evils, economic in character, which menace not only the stability of present-day society, but its very existence. Pius XI has pointed out these false doctrines, as well as their direful consequences. And they exist because men have forgotten or despise the fundamental truth that Christ is the Head of the human race. There can be no doubt of the fact that the great evils of the day are traceable directly to the almost universal denial of the sovereign rights of Christ in the social, the economic, and the political field. How can any semblance of order be brought back to a world which is manifestly headed for disaster and ruin? Only by the universal recognition that a right order exists, of which order Christ is the head and sovereign. By proclaiming Christ our King, and living up to this belief, we would explicitly and definitely overthrow the principles of anarchy, of socialism, of communism, and of every other man-made doctrine which has attempted to deceive us into the belief that peace, justice, and tranquility can be secured on any other terms than by submission to the order which Christ Himself established.

A feast in honor of the Social Reign of Christ would very effectively impress upon the world the belief of the Church that religion is not a mere private affair, something to be put on or off like a Sunday suit of clothes. Religion is the very breath of life, on weekdays as well as Sundays. It must enter into and vitalize all our actions. Therefore, the duties and responsibilities of citizenship are of supreme importance to every Catholic. He knows only too well that he cannot be an upright, intelligent, and patriotic citizen of the country to which he belongs if he is not at one and the same time a model and exemplary Catholic. Politicians have attempted and have succeeded only too well in making of religion a purely private matter. On the specious plea of toleration, they have banished religion from the state, from the school, from every public function. The result has been that the state, education, even our amuse-

ments have become secularized. Under such circumstances it is little wonder that people have begun first to minimize religion and then to deny it any place whatsoever in the life of the state or of the individual. But no Catholic can accept a second place for his religion. God comes before everything else, and the Catholic feels that he must assert this primacy in his life, both private and public. Pope Leo XIII, in his wonderful encyclicals on the social duties of Catholics, made quite clear what our line of action must be. Catholics cannot in conscience permit free-thinkers and atheists to mould public opinion according to their false philosophies. They must, therefore, participate actively in public affairs, bringing to the consideration and solution of every problem the living truth of Christ. This responsibility, which is ours by reason both of our citizenship and our religion, can best be impressed on all Catholics by a public expression of belief in the leadership of Christ. For the Catholic is not only a citizen of this world. He is also a citizen of the Kingdom of God, of which Christ is the ruler. Let the Church, therefore, by a public act, such as a feast in honor of Christ, the Universal King of Society, proclaim this belief in our heavenly citizenship and in the reign of Christ over us, and all the world shall know where the Catholic stands. We, too, shall come to know and understand better the implications of this dual allegiance and shall be confirmed in our resolutions not only to be good Catholics, but to be patriotic, unselfish citizens as well. And particularly in our own beloved country has the Catholic layman a great contribution to make toward its peace, welfare, and security. Here the Church is respected and honored; its power for good is beyond question; its interest in the social and economic betterment of the country acknowledged on all sides. Nothing could assist us more in appreciating our debt to America, in strengthening our resolve to pay back in full all we owe her, than a universal recognition of the Kingship of Jesus Christ. With Jesus Christ as our publicly acknowledged King, we would obtain both the inspiration and courage needed to perform our tasks as citizens of this great Republic.

The possibility of the institution of a new feast to honor Jesus Christ, the Universal King of Society, has filled with blessed hope the hearts of many who had almost come to de-

spair of our modern civilization. To them the apostacy of the nations had gone so far that there appeared small prospect of their return to the fold of Christ. However, the light of the truth still shines brightly in a world where many see nothing but error and darkness. We must have confidence in Christ. He has conquered the world; He can conquer it again in our own day. There is no reason for despair. War, economic and social evils, religious indifference and unbelief are but temporary victories of the powers of death. Christ still lives, Christ reigns. The nations shall come once again under His dominion. Then there shall be inaugurated an era of universal peace and good-will. When the Kingdom of Christ is re-established amongst us, the peace of Christ shall become our lasting possession and heritage. All who are interested in, and assuredly both the clergy and laity are interested in the magnificent program of the Holy Father, "pax Christi in regno Christi", should unanimously resolve to do all in their power to bring about the day when Jesus Christ shall be solemnly proclaimed as the King and Ruler of human society.

JAMES H. RYAN.
The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

THE PRINCIPLE OF AUTHORITY IN THE CHURCH.

The following paper was read at a gathering of non-Catholics, most of whom were ministers of one or other of the non-Catholic bodies. In setting Catholic doctrine before a non-Catholic audience there is always this difficulty—that in matters of religion Catholics and non-Catholics commonly speak different languages: they may use the same words but the words frequently connote very different ideas. To obviate this difficulty the writer of the present article took as a common ground of communication the concept of the organic State familiar to most students of State-Philosophy. It has always seemed to the writer that this concept, now generally accepted, affords a forceful vindication of the claims of the Church, once you postulate the supernatural origin of the Church. In the discussion which followed the reading of the paper the leading critic confessed that he had come prepared to criticize Roman Catholic claims in detail, but that in the light of the address he had now but one question to raise: "Is the Church supernatural in its origin? If it is, then the claims of the Roman Church as set forth in

the address are irrefutable." For himself he was not prepared to admit the supernatural.

The supernatural origin of the Church is a further question not discussed in this paper; nor does the paper exhaust the conclusions to be drawn from the principles here laid down.

Within its limited scope the paper may however suggest to others a form of argument which may prove useful in presenting the teaching of the Church to the non-Catholic mind: for this reason it is offered to the readers of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

IN all human societies, if they are to live and flourish, two principles demand recognition—the principles of authority and liberty. When authority is lacking, a society becomes incoherent, a mere assemblage of individuals without corporate life; where liberty is unrecognized, a society is but a mere mechanism destructive of the sense of personal responsibility and consequently of moral character. In either case the society does not respond to the imperative need of the human personality: in the one case it lacks that corporate social life without which the human personality is incomplete; in the other it destroys the sense of individual responsibility without which personality is inconceivable.

Now the Catholic Church claims to be the society of the children of God redeemed by Jesus Christ. It is not merely a school of thought nor an aggregation of individuals held together by a similar interest: it is the Kingdom of Jesus Christ on earth: an organic society of which our Lord is sovereign ruler; in and through which the individual achieves the Christian life. As such the Church claims divine authority to teach and to govern and to dispense those means of grace which are necessary for the life in Christ.

Yet it is a society of responsible human beings. Nowhere has the law of liberty been more clearly proclaimed than in the New Testament: and nowhere, I venture to say, is the law of liberty more clearly recognized than in the Catholic Church.

At once innumerable difficulties present themselves in face of this claim of the Catholic Church to contain within itself a full measure of Christian liberty. Fundamentally however all these difficulties are concerned with two radical claims which have been through all the Christian ages regarded by Catholic

Christendom as essential to the very being of the Church: the one is the claim to infallibility in matters of faith; the other that authority to teach and govern is instrumentally placed by divine ordinance in the apostles and their successors. These claims to many minds seem incompatible with a rightful liberty and have led to the demand for a church without dogma and without popes whether Roman or otherwise.

To no small extent, the opposition to these Catholic claims springs from a misunderstanding of the Catholic position and from too external a view of Catholicism. Facts and doctrines are isolated from their context in the Catholic mind, with the result that their meaning is distorted and made to bear an un-Catholic significance. The amazement with which Catholics not infrequently hear non-Catholics invoking the authority of the Pope to settle off-hand some matter affecting the practical conscience of a people, would be (were it understood) a sufficient refutation of the mechanical absolutism often attributed to the Papacy.

But the opposition to these Catholic claims in many instances comes from a more positive source, the denial of the supernatural origin and character of Christianity as it is understood by the Catholic. Take away this supernatural character and the Catholic position crumbles away. It is only in the belief that Christianity and the Church do not belong to the merely natural order of human existence but proceed directly from the mind and will of our Divine Lord, that we can reasonably accept infallibility and what for convenience' sake I will call apostolic authority, i. e. the inherent right to teach and govern which is vested in the apostles and their successors. I will, then, consider first the supernatural basis upon which the authority of the Church rests; and then endeavor to determine the Catholic idea of authority and its relation to Christian liberty.

I. The Supernatural Basis of Church Authority.

The conception of Christianity as directly of supernatural origin and character, is, as I have said, fundamental to the Catholic position. The Christian revelation is not and never could be derived from the operation of man's own reason. The most complete content of human reason left to itself is

circumscribed by the created finite world in which our natural existence lies: but the Christian revelation carries us beyond that into the higher life of conscious union with God, a life in which we consciously participate in the eternal life of God Himself. In this supernatural life there is a transformation of values both as regards ourselves and that world in which we live—a transformation brought about by the direct operation of the Divine Spirit through Jesus Christ. Christ as the Divine Word is the Giver of this new life to us; we are and ever shall be merely recipients. The centre and source of this new life is always outside ourselves in Christ, the manifested Word of God to man. If then we seek for the sufficient reason and guide of this higher life, we find it not in ourselves but in Christ alone; and our ultimate salvation lies not in the fuller or fullest realization of our natural self but in the apprehension of the life which is in Christ.

Christ, therefore, is the ultimate authority in regard to the truth and life revealed in the Gospel. We cannot say of the Gospel life: "My reason tells me so, therefore it is true;" but we must say: "Christ says so, therefore it is true."

It is indeed the case that as we receive the truth from Christ, our reason will be informed by it and become one with it: and this truth will manifest itself more and more in terms of our own reason: yet always our reason will remain dependent for its knowledge upon the revealing life of Christ in whom alone this truth is revealed in an absolute sense: Christ being Himself the Truth, the Way and the Life. The Christian life is in a word essentially a life of discipleship toward Christ.

This being so, there can be no real parity between the philosophy of our own natural existence as men and the philosophy of the supernatural life in Christ; though there is a certain similarity in the process of development. In the one case our reason is the ultimate test, since it is the witness to a truth which is wholly comprehensible by the human mind—the truth of man's existence and of the world which is his natural sphere. In the other case it is brought into immediate relation with the Divine Truth which in its completeness must ever be beyond our ken and of which at the most we can get but a limited apprehension, though that limited appre-

hension will be our eternal beatitude. In this case reason can only be the handmaid of that revelation which comes to us through Jesus Christ; receiving and apprehending but never a sovereign arbiter of the truth itself. Thus it is by faith and not by reason that the substantive truth of the life in Christ is given us.

II. THE CHURCH AS THE WITNESS TO THE SUPERNATURAL.

So far all who accept a supernatural character for Christianity will accept the Catholic position. They will agree that the ultimate authority for the Christian life is Jesus Christ and that we can neither take away nor add to the revelation He has given us. He is the Master; we are the disciples. They will further agree that this supernatural life is conveyed to us not primarily through our logical understanding but through a personal union with our Divine Lord: a union which depends primarily upon the will of Christ, the giver of the new life, but secondarily and necessarily upon our own will accepting the life in Christ. This union manifests itself in virtues of faith, hope, and charity.

But this union with Christ—how is it effected? Is it a direct personal union between the individual and Christ? or is it a union mediated through the Church? I put the question as it is not infrequently put; though the antithesis suggested gathers its force from its very incompleteness. It derives its sting from the controversial temper rather than from the philosophical and the incompleteness of the antithesis reveals itself at once in the answer any intelligent Catholic would make. He would reply: this union is at once direct and mediated: at once individual and social. There is no true union with Christ which leaves out the Church; yet as a member of the Church, the individual is in immediate personal union with Christ.

The social philosopher will at once recognize a profound truth of human life in this reply. And it is just this truth that Catholicism stands for in the Christian life. Christianity is at once individual and social in character not merely as regards external activities but in its essential constitution as the religion of the Divine Word. As no man can live a true human life except in his relations with the world to which he

belongs, so no one can live the higher spiritual life except in his relations with the world as it is redeemed and restored in Christ. The Incarnate Word is the Principle of a new world and society—the Kingdom of God—and salvation comes to men only as they become members of this new Kingdom. This Kingdom is not merely an ideal society, nor is it a society held out to men as something yet to come and at present non-existent, as was the New Israel of the Hebrew prophets. But it is a society already existing, brought into being by the mission of our Lord amongst men. Christ came not as a prophet foretelling the future Kingdom of God on earth but as the beginning and principle of the Kingdom: and this Kingdom is the concrete manifestation of Christ indwelling in those who receive Him. In and through this society of which He is the Principle and the Soul, the Truth and Life of the Gospel is realized on earth.

That our Divine Lord should establish a concrete and visible society on earth seems to the Catholic but a logical outcome of the Incarnation. At any rate the Catholic believes that our Lord did proclaim Himself the beginning and Lord of an organic visible society in and through which He carries on His redemptive work in the world. The Church is thus the sovereign nation of Christ: "Christ's people", in the organic sense of the term; or, as it is commonly expressed, Christ's mystical body. It exists in Christ as in the principle of its life and draws from Him the truth and energy which makes it what it is and holds it together. At the same time Christ dwells in the Church—this People of His—as the unifying and energizing principle of its life. In this mutual indwelling the life of the Church is constituted. So that the individual cannot exist in the Church, as a living member of the Church, except in his union with Christ; nor can he exist in Christ except as a *de jure* member of the Church.

Now this organic conception of the Church as the mystical body of Christ has a direct bearing upon the question of authority in the Church: for if the Church is Christ's mystical body, it must share in the authority of Christ and witness with Him to the Truth and Life it receives from Him. Like all societies which are constituted in a moral or spiritual idea, the Church must be the ultimate witness to its own life—the life it receives

from Christ and which it derives from its union with Him. Fundamentally the Church in claiming to be the ultimate witness to the Truth it has received, claims no more than every corporate society claims as regards its own idea and purpose. The distinctive claim of the Church is that in this witnessing to itself it is divinely protected from error by the Divine Spirit, through its organic spiritual union with Christ our Divine Lord: but this claim proceeds directly from its supernatural origin and character.

III. Of Scripture and Tradition as the Ultimate Witness to the Faith.

The Church, then, as the mystical body of Christ—the Christian people united with Christ in the bond of faith, hope, and charity—is the living depositary of the Truth of the Gospel: and as Christ's mystical body it claims to witness to Christ and the Life in Christ. Its ultimate witness is twofold: *Scripture and Catholic Tradition.* This twofold witness is due to the peculiar origin and character of the Christian life. On the one hand it is the manifestation of the Divine Truth itself in which the Christian life is constituted; on the other it is the manifestation of this Truth as it operates in the world for the world's salvation. In the first case, this Divine Truth itself has been supremely and absolutely manifested in the Incarnate Word, our Divine Lord; this manifestation was adumbrated in the Old Testament; it was witnessed to as an accomplished fact in the New Testament. Whether we take the earthly life and mission of our Lord itself, or the inspired word of the Scriptures—it is the Divine Word's declaration of a new life to the world. As such the inspired Scriptures have authority as a determined divine manifestation of the Gospel Life.

But this manifestation is, strictly speaking, outside ourselves. To become operative in us it must be received into our own minds: we must apprehend it: it must become part of our own consciousness. The Scripture witnesses to the fact and truth of the Incarnation itself and of the Kingdom of God of which the Incarnation is the origin and law. But we need a further witness as to the truth and life of the Incarnate Word as it operates upon and becomes part of our own consciousness.

That witness exists in the mind or corporate consciousness of the Church in its mystical union with Christ.

The expression of this corporate consciousness or mind of the Church as the mystical body of Christ, constitutes Tradition.

Tradition therefore is the witness to the Truth of the Christian life as it enters into our human consciousness, and consequently the safeguard against erroneous interpretation; and it is a real safeguard, for in virtue of the organic union of the Church with Christ, this corporate elucidation and interpretation is divinely safeguarded against error.

I need hardly point out, at least to students of the philosophy of the State, that this corporate consciousness of which I speak, and consequently this corporate interpretation, has nothing to do with a mathematical enumeration of individual members. One man may be a true witness to the corporate consciousness of the State or organic society, even though the rest of the individual members contradict him. The corporate consciousness of a society is not the mass of individual opinions which float on the surface, but that deeper conviction which is the basis and soul of the social fabric; which in history proves itself by its persistence and consistency, whilst the mere opinions of men as individuals come and go with the passing moments, except in so far as they express the deeper conviction of the social organism itself. That is true of all organic societies and not merely of the Catholic Church.

In this paper I am not attempting an apology for the Catholic position; I am merely endeavoring to expound what that position is. Consequently I am not called upon to argue the necessity for such a witness to the right interpretation of the Christian life such as Tradition gives. As a matter of fact all organic societies appeal to their tradition as a witness to their true idea and purpose. But in the Church there is the further claim that this Tradition is divinely safeguarded against the errors of human judgment through the organic union of the Church with Christ as the animating and informing principle of its life.

Thus, then, we have two authoritative witnesses to the Gospel Truth: the inspired witness of the Scriptures declaring to man the mission of the Divine Word on earth; and the divinely protected witness of Catholic Tradition to the right

human apprehension of the Truth and its fulfilment in the conscious life of the Church.

IV. Of the Church as the Visible and Instrumental Witness to the Truth.

Scripture and Tradition are the substantive and ultimate witness to the Christian life. But the Church would not be a true organic society if it lacked an external visible authority to voice the internal sovereignty inherent in its constitution and to give effect to its mission. If, as the Catholic Church claims, it is the society or body instituted by Jesus Christ, to teach and realize the Kingdom of God amongst men, that fact carries with it the necessity for a visible authoritative government. That visible authority lies in the apostolic government ordained by Jesus Christ Himself. I will not delay to argue the historical development of the principle of apostolic government and the questions to which it gives rise. If the development of this principle as it exists to-day in the recognition of the Papacy, is not a true development, it will at least be necessary to create a new form of apostolic government which will correspond to the essential unity of the Church in faith and at the same time maintain that vital development which is the mark of a living organism. So far the Christian bodies which have fallen away from Rome have failed either as to the one principle or the other.

What I would point out here is that the apostolic government of the Church is wholly consistent with the supernatural character of the Church as derived directly from the will of Christ. As the society of the Church is constituted not by the will of the Christian people, except in a secondary sense, but by the will of Christ, one would expect that this sovereign will of Christ should be operative in the external body of the Church and in its government. Hence the investment of the ruling power in apostolic succession and the derivation of external authority not from the will of the people but from the apostolic order, is but the logical corollary of Christ's own Lordship over the Church.

But this authority vested in the external rulers is after all only an instrumental or ministerial authority, voicing and interpreting that substantive authority which is inherent in the

body corporate. If on the one hand it has a certain character of absolutism, as being derived not from the will of the people but from the will of Christ, on the other hand it is conditioned in its operation by its dependence upon the corporate life of the Church itself, both as to its interpretation of the Truth received from Christ and as to its guidance of the Christian people in the application of this Truth to practical conduct. Popes, for instance, cannot invent doctrines; they can but declare what the Church in its corporate consciousness holds to be a truth; they cannot anticipate the vital movements of Catholic piety: theirs is but to sanction such movements as they are already approved by "the common sense"—I use the phrase philosophically—of the Church. External authority is thus in the strictest sense ministerial: but in all that appertains to the essential Truth and right conduct of the Christian life, this authority shares in the characteristic traits of that ultimate substantive authority which lies in the body of the Church itself. Thus, as Catholic Tradition is infallible, so in its authoritative voicing of this tradition the external authority is infallible, divinely protected by the ordinance of Christ from leading the Church into error.

V. So far I have dealt with the principle of authority as a static principle in the constitution of the Church. We turn to it now as an operative element in the formation and development of the Christian people.

The most vital question which arises at this point is: where does the liberty which is essential to a moral conception of man come into the Catholic conception of the Church?

Undoubtedly there is a sense, as we have already seen, in which the Catholic conception of authority in the Church approaches to that conception of "government by divine right" which we have come to reprobate in the secular governments of the world. Yet I trust that I have already made it clear, how essentially the Catholic conception of authority differs from the travesty of "the divine right of Kings" which our English Stuarts and German Kaisers have endeavored to enforce. For the Church as a social organism rests explicitly upon the most democratic of all social conceptions, the substantive ultimate authority of the corporate consciousness or mind of the Church in its mystical union with Christ. The

Catholic conception of the ultimate authority of Catholic Tradition has, in fact, anticipated the most democratic of secular social theories.

We have then to keep in mind as regards Catholic life, the absolutism of Christ, the Incarnate Word, in the structure of the Church which He instituted, and the necessary realization of that life, intellectually and morally, by the Christian people for the fulfilment of the Christian idea. It is as concerning this self-realization of the Christian life in the body of the Church that the Catholic conceptions of the *Depositum Fidei* and of Catholic Tradition give to the Catholic a true sense of liberty, social and individual. For the *Depositum Fidei* is not, so to speak, a catena of formulated articles of faith lodged in some by-corner of the Church and produced at will by the visible authority: it is the animating truth itself as it has informed and always will inform the vital organism or corporate life of the Church; much in the same way as its specific idea vitalizes and gives form to a nation. It is indeed fully explicit in the mind of Christ: it is but imperfectly explicit in the human consciousness of the body of the Church: but it is there all the time as the animating and informing Truth of life. It becomes explicit as the human mind under the stress of experience investigates this mystery of its Faith. As we have seen, this explicit elucidation in the corporate consciousness of the Church is the subject matter of Catholic Tradition.

Now in regard to Tradition it is well to take notice, first, that it is the expression, not of any individual opinion nor of any mass of individual opinions, but of the corporate mind of the Church; and secondly that it is an essential note of the body corporate; that is to say, it must continue to exist as a condition and witness of the vital activity of the Christian life. Take away that continuous activity of conscious life which Tradition denotes and there will be neither life nor freedom in the Church: it would sink into a mere monumental existence, witnessing to something which once was alive but is so no longer.

The whole question of freedom in the Church is thus intimately bound up with the action of this conscious evolution or development to the truth of which Catholic Tradition witnesses. It is a question primarily of the right relation between the

individual mind and the general consensus of the Catholic body; and secondarily of the relation of the individual to external legal authority. First, as to the relation of the individual mind to the general consensus, or corporate judgment, of the Church.

Assuming, as the Catholic holds, that the Church is a corporate society, it is evident that individual judgment as to what is the truth and life of the social body, must be in some way subject to the society's corporate judgment. That is a principle accepted for practical purposes in every body corporate. The individual must submit his judgment to the general judgment of the State, or in the ultimate resort become outlawed. But in every secular society, dependent for its ultimate witness upon human reason itself, this submission of the individual will always admit of a provisional internal dissent, an appeal to what the individual will claim as a more advanced reasonable condition of the general mind of the society at large. Whereas the assent required by the Catholic Church to its general judgment on matters concerning the Truth of its own life—that is to say, the Faith in which it is founded—is absolute and internal, not merely external and provisional. There is indeed a sphere of thought and moral activity within the cognizance of the Church, where this external and provisional assent is legitimate. We will refer to that further on. But as regards the fundamental Truth, or the Faith, of the Christian life, individual assent must be absolute and internal wherever the corporate judgment of the Church declares itself. But this is clearly explicable and reasonable if, as the Catholic believes, Christ dwells in the Church as its informing principle of life and by His indwelling safeguards the Church as a body corporate, from error.

Less evident perhaps, even assuming the Catholic position as to the ultimate infallibility of the general judgment of the Church, is the relation of the individual mind to this corporate judgment not in its final decisions, but in its process of conscious development. What part does the individual mind legitimately take in what we may call the formation of the explicit consciousness of the Church? Or, in other words, has the individual any inherent right to investigate and form individual judgments as to the right interpretation of the Christian life?

Now if we look back upon the history of the Catholic Church we must at once notice that all developments whether in dogma —the intellectual apprehension and definition of Catholic Truth itself—or in piety, its moral and affective apprehension—or in the external government of the Church, have all been due in the first instance to the activity of individuals. The history of Catholic development is on one side the history of individual activity within the Church. In the intellectual sphere this development as we trace it in history, has always begun in a clash of individual opinions; as the clash of opinions proceeds, there forms an *instinctive but definite conviction* in the body of the Church as to the truth or error of the opinions put forth. This conviction is at first negative in character in this that it detects the error in the opinions set forth more quickly than the truth which will issue eventually from the clash of opinion. But it is nevertheless a true conviction not merely an opinion—an expression of true self-knowledge not of mere logical argument. Gradually this conviction assumes a more positive character as men begin to perceive more clearly the point at issue.

That being the historic process of the development of Catholic Truth—a development, be it remembered, essential to the Catholic conception of the Christian life—it is clear that the individual has not only a right to investigate and form judgments within the sphere of Catholic Truth, but in certain circumstances it is his duty: it becomes his duty either when it is necessary for his own advancement in the spiritual life, or for the good of the Church at large.

So too in the sphere of Catholic piety, every Catholic has a duty to be faithful to those spiritual illuminations which come to him individually and draw him to some specific form of practical conduct toward God or toward his fellow creatures in his service of God.

And again as a citizen of the Church—a member of the mystical body of Christ—every Catholic has an inherent responsibility, conditioned of course by his particular sphere of activity and his capacity, for the general welfare of the Church. No Catholic stands alone: as a member of the Church he must bear its burden and share in its activities.

This freedom of individual action proceeds in fact from the very conception of the Church as a morally organic body or

corpus mysticum, in which the individual is not a servile subject, but a real co-partner in the common life: a co-partner that is, not in the mere sharing out of common advantages but in the very life itself of the body corporate.

But the same fact—the existence of the Church as a body corporate—which confers upon him this freedom of responsible individual action, also conditions its exercise. One of these conditions calls for special mention: it applies equally to any body corporate as well as to the Church.

It is this: there can be no loyal and constructive thinking or action where one assumes mentally or morally a merely individual attitude and thus puts himself in reality outside the body corporate: in doing so he loses that social sense without which no man can be the mere interpreter of the larger life in which he would move. It is only as one takes one's stand, mentally and morally, inside a body corporate that individual freedom becomes constructive and avoids the danger of sheer anarchy.

So in the Catholic Church, individual activity—apart from the obedience demanded to definite authoritative pronouncements of the *consensus fidelium*—is conditioned by the requirement of this social sense with its regard for the common thought and life of the community and for the effect which individual action may have toward the common welfare. In other words, the Church demands—and rightly demands, if it is a true society—that individual activity be governed by loyalty to one's fellow members in the body of the Church in its historic continuity as well as its present phase of existence. But such loyalty is in no way a hindrance to honest and sincere investigation in matters intellectual, nor to a rightful conscientious assertion of one's opinions in matters practical. One need not labor the point: it is sufficient to take the analogous case of the honest patriot, such as Chatham when he opposed the disastrous policy of the British Government toward the American colonies; or, to take an ecclesiastical instance, the candid outspoken intellectual attitude of Cardinal Newman.

To a large extent the considerations which determine the attitude of the individual toward the corporate body, also determine his attitude toward the external authority which

represents and governs the Church: that is, as the Catholic holds, the Pope and the episcopate in union with the Pope.

When however we come to consider the question of the external authority, we have to remember that its validity is derived in a twofold manner. As to its form, it is of divine ordinance derived from the will of Christ as Founder of the Church; consequently that divinely ordained form of government lies outside the determinate action of the human will, whether taken corporately or individually. As to what we may term the substantive authority itself which is exercised through the divinely ordained ministers, that is one and the same as the authority which resides in the body of the Church. Thus the validity of a Papal dogmatic definition is derived on the one part from the divine authority which the Pope has in virtue of his apostolic order, and on the other from the fact that such a definition expresses not the Pope's individual conviction of the truth defined, but the corporate conviction of the Church itself.

It is just because a Papal dogmatic definition does express the corporate conviction of the Church that the absoluteness and infallibility of a Papal dogmatic utterance cannot take away from that liberty which is in the Church. The title *Servus Servorum Dei* is assumed by the Pope in no mock-humility: it expresses a real Catholic conviction. Hence whilst on the one hand the authority inherent in the Church and the Papacy demands a loyal obedience, yet on the other hand loyalty does not preclude the responsible rights inherent in Catholic citizenship, to which I have already alluded.

Chief amongst these rights is the right of witnessing to the Faith as it presents itself to the individual mind and conscience, in due submission, however, to any ultimate dogmatic definition of the *Depositum Fidei* in which, as we have seen, the life of the Church exists.

There is also the right to a responsible voice in regard to those matters which directly concern, not so much the spiritual and substantive life of the Church, but its preëminently secular activities, whether in intellectual life or practical; as, for instance, the scientific elaboration of speculative theology, matters appertaining to external ecclesiastical discipline, or secular polity. In such matters the freedom of a Catholic as a mem-

ber of the Church is conditioned merely by the same principles which safeguard the existence of any body corporate, namely due regard for the stability and dignity of the governing authority and for the general welfare of the society at large. These conditions have indeed in the case of the Catholic, a greater weight from the higher spiritual purpose for which the Church exists and from the inherent sanctity attaching to a divinely instituted order of authority: but in their essence they are the same as those which dictate any individual activity within a corporate body.

Such in brief is the Catholic position as it is taught and accepted in the Church itself. The Church indeed differs from ordinary human organic societies inasmuch as it is supernatural in origin and character and again as its ministerial authority is of divine ordinance, instituted by Christ and not derived from the human will of its members. But, as we have seen, this ministerial authority is itself conditioned by the authority which lies in the corporate body itself in its mystical union with Christ. In this sense the seat of authority lies in the corporate Church: even Popes can define a dogma only by appeal to the *consensus fidelium*. But as the ministerial authority is itself of divine institution, the magisterial authority in the Church can express itself only through the divinely appointed ministry. Were this ministry thus divinely appointed and therefore irremovable, liable to error in that which vitally affects the existence and proper function of the Church, namely the interpretation of the Faith in which the Church exists, then indeed it might be said that its "privileged" condition as existing by divine institution, were a menace to the Faith itself and to the whole Catholic life established in that Faith. The infallibility of the Pope and of the episcopate in union with him, in defining Catholic Faith and Morals, is a divine protection against this menace: as such this infallibility is at once the safeguard of the authority in the body corporate of the Church and of the liberty of its members: for where there is truth there is liberty.

FATHER CUTHBERT, O.S.F.C.

Oxford, England.

THE LIBRARY OF A PRIEST.[1]

Criteria.

I. Directive Criteria in Reading.
II. Errores Serpentes.
III. Phrases.

I. Directive Criteria in Reading.

FALSEHOOD being constantly mingled with truth, it is a question of personal safety for the priest, as well as of integrity in the discharge of his duty, that he be qualified to recognize falsity. Often enough, however, it is so subtle as to escape analysis, or it manages to fall short of exciting suspicion and reaction. To such an extent is this so in the bland, insinuating, incessant propaganda of press, periodicals and books, that some little while after Pius X's pronouncement on modernism a certain Reverend dignitary of New York observed in Rome: "Many of our good people are modernists without knowing it"! The spirit of enterprise in the effort to mislead by the printed word is not unlike what another gentleman, a scientist and convert, noted in an acquaintance of his, some busybody of a person: "That slimy scoundrel," he said, "has been trying for years to ruin my faith!" The more the pity that, being thus forewarned and forearmed, the same scientist should have finally succumbed, and making shipwreck of his faith should have died out of the Church.

We may advance some criteria for distinguishing truth from falsehood. But, in the first place, we take note of a subjective frame of mind, which like good blood serves somewhat to sterilize evil.

"Puro cernamus intuitu," says the Church.[2] There is an insight in the Catholic mind, an intuition largely proceeding from purity of heart, which finds no difficulty in absorbing Catholic doctrines, rites, practices, approved traditions, and is

[1] In the preceding general article, on the Library of a Priest, the name of the *Catholic Encyclopedia* slipped out of Father Hughes's redaction, when he was referring to books of reference (May number, p. 485)—an omission of his which he considers the more serious, as the excellent *Catholic Encyclopedia* is ever more and more an authority in America and in Europe, for the erudition which it contains and for the authenticity of its information.

[2] Octave of the Epiphany; *Post-Communio*.

as much alive to imponderable elements of the faith as it is inert and irresponsive to things of another sort. It may be likened to a taste or a scent, very much opposed to what some good converts have marked in their own habit of mind: "It is not what we have to learn," they said, "but what we have to unlearn that troubles us." As to outsiders, since they and Catholics live in different worlds of thought, the frame of mind which is so illumined by faith and taught of God—*erunt docibiles Dei*—is altogether foreign and contrary to what is prevalent among certain classes of persons, who find it strange that Catholics should take the faith so easily. This is just what St. Peter says of such classes in their general attitude toward all virtue, and therefore toward the reasonable service of faith: "They find it strange," he says, that you are not like them in their vices, and they "blaspheme" in presence of the fact.[3] Such a healthy state of mind, susceptible of divine truth, is subjective. However excellent, it is not enough to assure immunity from the contagion of error.

Objectively, to aid the movements of a sound and healthy mind, there are certain rules or laws, which were drawn up long ago for thinking with the Church. The occasion for putting them in form at that time was the appearance of Protestantism, at the beginning of this same Reformation era in which our lot has been cast. The principles enunciated are the following:

We should be prompt in obeying whatever emanates from the true spouse of Christ, the holy Catholic hierarchical Church, whose authority cannot deceive or mislead any more than He can who teaches her and teaches through her. Accordingly, we should approve and favor the frequent reception of the Sacraments, Holy Eucharist and Penance. In the matter of divine worship, we should commend the hearing of Mass, the psalmody of the Church, prolonged prayers in public and in private, and all the other functions ordained for the divine service. We ought to treat with special honor the counsels of perfection, works of supererogation, the penitential life; revere the relics of the Saints, indulgences, devotions, the splendor of sacred ornamentation and ritual; accept with promptitude all precepts of the Church, defending her ordinances, and in no

[3] I. Peter, 4.4: ξενίζονται Vulgate: "admirantur".

case carping at or criticizing them. We must treat with respect all authority, whatever or whoever be the subject in whom it is invested. Due esteem is to be entertained for both sides of theology, the positive and the Scholastic; the former being that of the Fathers, who looked rather to exhorting souls, and arousing the spirit of solid devotion; the latter being that of St. Thomas and other Scholastic doctors, who followed a reasoned system of demonstration, "to define and make clear for our times the things necessary unto salvation, and to show forth all errors and fallacies", and who had at their service not only the intelligence of Holy Scripture and the learning of the ancient Fathers, but also the councils, canons and constitutions elaborated during so many centuries of the Church's history. In fine, keeping to the beaten track, and talking sanely of persons and things, we should treat sparingly of grace and predestination, much of good works; and, in the matter of serving God, we ought to extol not merely such love as is disinterested, pure and sublime, but also that other most useful form of love and fear, which is self-interested, seeking to escape punishment, to reach salvation and merit eternal rewards.[4]

The Catholic mind is so much imbued with principles of this kind, that its spirit of docility and obedience has been cast up to Christian populations and denounced as unworthy of strong minds. But, let the spirit of rebellion and dissent be what it may, these principles of thought and life are directive guides to be relied on for accepting, rejecting or discriminating what may be advanced; and, in particular, for repudiating not only plain statements of falsehood but also subtle implications which leave a bad taste in the mouth.

And, just to put in its right place the assumption that a strong mind goes hand in hand with rebelliousness, captiousness and dissent, we may recall St. Thomas's reflection that sanctity of mind goes hand in hand with obedience to law. For, says he, the closer one is joined to God the better off is he, *tanto efficitur melioris conditionis;* and law it is, obligation, obedience, which conjoins with God, ennobling man by the union: "What other nation is there so renowned, that hath ceremonies and just judgments and all the law that I set before you this day"![5]

[4] *Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius: Regulae ad sentiendum cum Ecclesia.*
[5] Deut. 4:8.

And therefore, he concludes, all who are in higher places, and bound down by the more exacting obligations of their state, are in better condition than those who are lower, looser and freer;[6] to which latter class may be referred the beasts of the field. "Happy necessity," exclaims St. Augustine, "which compels to higher things!"[7] It is one of God's titles to praise for kindness and condescension that He gives such direction and law; and that He does not leave us stranded and lost, off the road or in the woods, where the one blurred vision of life is that of "seeing men walking like trees". *"Dulcis et rectus Dominus; propter hoc legem dabit delinquentibus in via".*[8]

Of views and visions, of opinions and theories, under the shadow of which so much is written and published, we ought, by the rule of contraries, give some examples, borrowed from the literature of the passing moment. For the young priest may not have leisure to spend on surveying an alien worship, *deum alienum,* and on appraising schools of what is called modern thought. Thus he may find it useful to see briefly registered here, as on a tablet, some of the errors and phrases on which people declaim and dogmatize. Not a few fashions of thought and ways of speech exhibit under form and phrase the clothes of truth covering the body of error. This is falsehood's homage to better things. Other systems are more barefaced and brazen, and do not trouble themselves with being hypocritical.

II. Errores Serpentes.

COMMON CHRISTIANITY. There is the notion and phrase of a "Common Christianity", meaning some thin residue or sediment of divers religious denominations. The Catholic bishops of an ecclesiastical province[9] issued a declaration to the faithful (in Lent, 1924), taking note of the elements in this idea; how it flaunts "a right and fuller understanding of the Christian faith"; how religion is a veiled kingdom that still needs discovering; when unveiled and discovered, it will stand revealed as a poor Bethlehem (without that Church and doc-

[6] St. Thomas, *Summa Theol.*, 1a, 2ae q.98, a.5, ad 2[m].
[7] Ibid., 2a2ae, q.88, a.4, *de voto*, ad 1[m].
[8] Ps. 24:8.
[9] Birmingham, England.

trine which the Babe of Bethlehem came to establish and make known); for, be it understood, all "organized" Christianity, that is, the Church of which Christ is the author, has failed; we want no such thing as an "institutional", historical, traditional and visible religion, with its priesthood, authority, doctrine, Sacraments. The disembodied religion of a standardized Christianity will do without even the Bible as interpreted by authority.

DISCOVERING RELIGION. A writer on *Classic American Literature*[10] formulates the need and creed of his day: Be loyal, he says, and give free play to every element in your nature; the kingdom of heaven is within you; be whole and wholly yourself; let your own soul guide you; act by your intuitions; for the Holy Ghost is within you, a creative power resolving all your antagonisms into harmony. There being no question any longer of doctrine or decalogue, of virtue or vice, a lay preacher at the recent Oxford Conference of Modern Churchmen laid it down for them, that Christ never meant to give a law to any one, but only to stimulate every one in the search of religious truth, and of the laws which it suits every one to lay down for himself.

PREDESTINATION. We read on the front page of a great journal this declaration, dictated and paid for by a certain religious interest: It "believes that, whatever their differences in this world, all men are equal citizens when they attain to the kingdom of heaven; and proclaims salvation for all men, from all sin, for all time." This old Calvinism and Lutheranism leaves no place for the greatest kindness which a man can do to humanity, that of letting it know there is to be a judgment, a hell and a heaven.

AUTONOMY OF REASON. Permeating the outer world, and at the same time filtering into the Catholic reserve, is that notion, coming from Kant, about the self-sufficiency or "autonomy" of reason, which alone should give laws for oneself to observe, and could never think of abasing itself to accept injunctions either from God or from any authority under Him. Some Catholics may be heard lapsing into similar ideas with respect to the mind and authority of the Church, as when, in the matter of positive ordinances imposing fast, abstinence, attendance at

[10] D. H. Lawrence.

Mass, they have said: "We know well enough what suits us, without being told;" or, "We have enough to do in putting up with the inconveniences of heat and cold, without adding discomforts". This takes off the edge, not only of obedience to authority but of self-denial, and naturally of asceticism, which is the studied practice of all virtue unto Christian perfection. Of course there are many ways of shirking obedience to authority, as that of the modernist who challenges any command of the Church by asking where is the "definition of faith" to that effect? He has forgotten the Fourth Commandment on legitimate authority; and he evades obedience by flying to faith. A Reverend modernist professor, now disavowed and excommunicated by the Church, expressed it otherwise, when giving counsel to a convert: that it was strictness which caused violations; implying that law should dangle about you at loose ends, and you do as you like. In one of his earliest documents on Italian affairs,[11] Pius XI, happily reigning, called it "a kind of modernism" in morals, in matters of authority and social things, if Catholics presumed that the directions and prescriptions of his immediate predecessors could lightly be pushed aside as obsolete—another easy way of shelving or pigeon-holing obligations.

But infinite are the ways of asserting self against self-denial, and maintaining self-will against law; and perhaps it is not necessary to fall back upon Kant's autonomy of reason for an explanation. The garden of Eden and the forbidden fruit will suffice. We only observe that a leading materialist[12] put the whole theory in its most brutal form when he affirmed: "It is absurd to imagine that duty imposes self-denial; only a contingent necessity can impose it in some instance, as a chance excursion into a strange land;" and this thinker accepted heartily St. Paul's definition of his class: "*Quorum deus venter est*", accentuating every meaning of those words. It so happens that at this moment an old man dies at the age of eighty, a member of the French Academy, an apostate from the faith of his youth;[13] and the eulogy of his life sums up the work of his prolific and elegant pen as that of "an epicurean who, hav-

[11] *Ubi Arcano Dei.*

[12] Feuerbach.

[13] Anatole France.

ing no faith in another world, dreamed and longed for something in the nature of a paradise on earth".

SANCTIONS. Pedagogy to-day outside of the good traditional schools, is suffering from an idea of kindred origin with the autonomy of reason; that duty and virtue are not to be associated with the hope of reward, nor with any sanctions in the way of punishment. Children ought to be indoctrinated with the love of duty for its own sake. What mortal never asks of men or women adult, that they conduct business or discharge their duty, that they spend time and labor, without any sentiment of either hope or fear, that the child ought to do from the first; and what Christ our Lord has not imposed upon humanity, or even on sanctity, the obligation to harbor only the quintessence of love for God and to face duty without expectation of reward, that is what, with Jansenistic impracticability, the merest child is to do for love of an abstraction. The meaning, however, is clear. From whatever side it be, sanctions must be expunged from the mind, with all idea of penalty, atonement. And thus, in civic life and law, we observe how retributive justice for crime committed is being undermined; and every criminal is to be coddled.

THE "UNMORAL". Another attack on morality is again from the side of pedagogy. It is from the same direction of the abstract, the useless and impracticable. Its tenet is that teaching should be "unmoral". Children should receive everything bare and bald, with no significance of right or wrong about it, of true or false, and certainly no implication of religion. It is "neutrality" toward everything. Pious narratives from Scripture or anywhere else should not be told to children, for this is a way of conveying morality "disguised", as medicine is disguised; and "we should not diet children's minds on disguised morals". All this was said recently (1922) in a respectable English quarter, on behalf of the Socialist city council in Vienna, whose chief of education banished from the city schools 80,000 volumes of Catholic monarchical purport and color. It was thus that a man who died the other day in England,[14] had delivered himself of some twenty pedagogical articles, to teach teachers; and he had instructed them that religion should be taught without mention

[14] Clutton-Brock.

of God. Children ought to discover Him for themselves; for we are interested in what we unearth ourselves.

THE PRINCIPLE OF CAUSALITY. This sounds very philosophical; but it is remarkable what practical effects have come out of it, or rather out of the denial of it. It is from Hume's time and his theory of the Association of Ideas that people have thought it worth their while to discuss and to deny the principle of causality; either to discuss whether we can know that effects have causes, or to deny it altogether, that things must have a sufficient reason for being, or they would not be. This principle and that other: A thing cannot be and not be at the same time, have come to be denied outright. The result of all this philosophizing is obvious; it is that of not acknowledging a designer and author of nature, any action of the Artist's mind, any exercise of God's power. This is the theory which makes the universe, man and history, a chapter of accidents, that happened to fall out just so by chance; and, written in this sense, the latest form of literature, which threatens to become popular for feeble minds, is of Wells's kind, *An Outline of History*. A book which passes through our hands[15] presumes to give the "philosophy" of all this by building the theory up on what it calls the "Law of Chance". As chance means the absence of law, the "law of chance" must mean the law of the absence of law—a fair sample of what kind of mentality results when the mind is sedulously trained to contradict itself.

It was on the strength of this mental feebleness, already made epidemic by certain philosophies of idealists and sceptics and pessimists, that Darwinism, with its suggestions of living species having originated by certain laws of accidents, floated in triumphantly as a system approved and accepted for the time being. When it came to be discarded in every chapter and verse of its original creed, and passed into the present period of post-Darwinian Evolutionism, the very same mentality passed over from the predecessor to the successor.

EVOLUTIONISM. Darwinism survived in a philosophy, to which it bequeathed its chapter of accidents, as a sufficient suggestion of the origin of species. Evolutionism, still calling itself a natural science of observation, has wandered far beyond

[15] *The Way;* by A. Ure.

the bounds of scientific facts observed, and has insinuated its philosophy about origins into every department of what should have remained strictly science. History, literature, sacred science, have all been overrun with the applications of this philosophy and its consequences; and even, latest of all, high abstract mathematics[16] have been taken to enforce the theory of chance and accident governing all creation, and dispensing with the idea of a Creator. Evolutionism floats on the supposition, and gloats over the notion, in contradiction to the essence of causality, that mankind and other species, that the world at large and all its design, could have appeared somehow, and could have grown as well as have maintained themselves in being and form, without any need of a First Cause and designer, without any call for a continued supporter and provider. You are considered to be asking for something unreasonable if you demand a cause equal to the effect, a sufficient reason to explain a fact. One authority has just given expression for the hundredth time to the essential cast of this mentality, and to its cant, by saying that, though no positive proof can be adduced for the evolution of man from lower species, still not to accept that theorem is intellectual suicide.

IMMORTALITY. As with the beginning of things, so with the end—what is to become of us? It was because of the ending, and of the shape to be given to it, that the beginning or origins were attacked, and the proper shape given to them, that they might tally. Here is the subject of immortality, or, as moderns prefer to say, "survival". This latter term is thought not to compromise the question; it means much less than immortality; for, as we see, everybody survives somebody, and yet dies after all. So the question is kept decently colorless by saying "survival" instead of immortality. It is noteworthy here, how the latest thought goes back thousands of years to old paganism, at least in part. Cicero had said, that death was to be contemned, because it is extinction; he went on to say that "except fault and sin, *praeter culpam et peccatum*", nothing can happen to man which is horrible or fearful.[17] The most modern thought repeats the old fallacy of death being extinction; it leaves out the rest about fault and sin. Nine well-known

[16] Einstein's.

[17] Cicero, *Ad familiares*, l.v.21, Mescennio. Cf. l.vi.1, Torquato.

writers have just combined to produce a symposium on Immortality.[18] All of them together, Christians, churchmen, laymen, believers, unbelievers, do not seem to advance much beyond where Cicero left the matter. As to retribution for "fault and sin", it is conceived that bad men who have died without a shadow of right to happiness or recompense might survive just temporarily and then somehow be annihilated. For the rest, the idea of survival takes the form of a continued existence in a more perfect fellowship with God. Every one that survives is clearly beatified, or deified. We have come to Pantheism.

PANTHEISM. A Scotch professor of theology[19] rejects the idea that man is inherently an immortal soul; that such is not "a Christian belief", that it does not agree with the New Testament, nor with our present knowledge of man's origin and development, according to modern post-Darwinian tenets. But man becomes immortal by becoming an individual through evolution, whereupon there emerges "a moral linkage" with God. There is a God-consciousness; and, as man enters thus a moral world, his individuality, now acquired, becomes immortality, establishing harmonious relations with God. This is the unity which makes eternal life. So the professor of Christian theology calls this pantheism: *Evolution and Eternal Life.*

MAN AN ACCIDENT. The man of affairs likewise, a British Minister,[20] neither philosopher nor theologian, nor with any pretence to be even a scientist, speaking in a college of social studies, affirmed that our sense of proportion was offended if we still regarded man as the substantial centre of the universe. Evolution has shown him to be only an accidental result here. . . . This was an echo of the idealist Hegel's notion on man in society, that he is not a substantive, but an adjective of his herd, of that social group or State into which he has happened to drop.—As to this last sociological error, it is a fallacy into which many good people seem to slip, when they make of the State a great substantive all-in-all, and of the individual a mere parasite or appendage, to be disposed of by the big thing in all matters little and great.

[18] Published by Putnam.

[19] J. Y. Simpson, Edinburgh.

[20] Baldwin, at Philip Stott College.

But to see this pantheism and materialism in one dramatic act, we may contemplate the scene and hear the eloquence of seven great orators at the catafalque of the French writer and apostate to whom we referred before.[21] A former Prime Minister,[22] apostrophizing the dead, exclaimed in his peroration: "O poet, may your soul, now dispersed in the divine light divinely chanted by you, now espousing the pure beauty of lines and curves, penetrate and impregnate the entire soul of humanity—Que votre âme, éparse dans la divine lumière par elle divinement chantée, épousant la pure beauté des lignes et des contours", etc. The actual Minister of Education[23] wound up a great speech with an invocation of the eternal "values", which we are now going to mention: "Thy books will be found at the bedside of all who worship, in one and the same cult, Humanity, Truth and Beauty."

VALUES. Among writers who moralize and profess to be profound, there is in vogue an obscure term, "values", which diffuses about their subject an atmosphere perfectly opaque. As is usual in these matters, whether treated profoundly or treated airily, it is vain to look for a definition of what is meant. But it may be defined by inference. Negatively, it means the elimination of concrete facts, and the substitution of abstract ideas, which will do no harm nor good to anybody. Thus there is no mention of plain and positive truth, of doctrine, of means unto salvation, of Sacraments, of virtues to be practised systematically and imperatively; those things are all too traditional, historical, "institutional", and the like. Positively, the term "values" has something in it, in as much as it just means the moral significance of things in our regard, their bearing and influence on our action; and so far implies that there is such a thing as morality. These values are named the Good, the Beautiful, the True; also Virtue and Intelligence. In the preceding paragraph we have heard some of them predicated over the licentious writer who was being buried. There are moral and humane values; and there is the discovery of the highest values in Christ and Christianity. By this same process some one finds an "infinite abstraction, or Ground of Values—what

[21] Anatole France, Paris, Oct. 18, 1924.

[22] M. Painlevé.

[23] M. F. Albert.

men commonly call God".[24] Of those values by which society lives and moves and has its being—probably prudence, justice, fortitude and temperance are meant—there is, says one lay preacher, a "transvaluation" into other qualities, when Jesus speaks of a "kingdom" of heaven.

But these "values", so called, are intended to be only abstractions, which have no subject in God as lawgiver, nor object in us as creatures bound to obey. They flit in the air, gratifying our abstract vanity as if we had something to do with them, but imposing on us no practical law, nor obligation, no more than mathematical points and equations, which are also abstractions and effect nothing. What they really are is our understanding of the eternal ideas, which are founded in the nature of God; and what they contain for our morality and perfectibility is the far-off and metaphysical origin of God's rights and our duties, of His laws and our obedience, our virtues and beatitude. But the way these things are talked of comes to just the same, whether it is atheism that is speaking, or positivism, that is agnosticism, or modernism.

In 1838, Dr. Newman being still a Protestant spoke of the whole thing as a pantheism, in which empty names were substituted for God, His law and religion. He said: "This is what the age is coming to . . . the spread of a pantheistic spirit, that is, the religion of beauty, imagination and philosophy, without restraint moral or intellectual, a religion speculative and self-indulgent. Pantheism is indeed the great deceit which awaits the age to come."

It is this idea of a pantheistic big All, End-All, disposing of All-in-All, that is made to account for the future state of the soul which, as a well-known poet expresses himself,[25] becomes "some diffusive power", felt in star and flower, or is absorbed, as a noted scientist put it,[26] into "the potential energy of the sun". Such a "dispersal" of the French free-thinker's "divinely sensual" soul in the "divine light" seems to have been expressed by the analogy of smoke which rose from cressets at the four corners of his catafalque; or, in the case of a German millionaire who died five months before him,[27] by the

[24] J. A. Leighton.
[25] Tennyson.
[26] Tyndall.
[27] Hugo Stinnes.

500 laurel trees about his cremated ashes, and the five wagon loads of flowers which mingled their fragrance with the odors of his spirit dispersed.

Meanwhile, observe the efficacy of this irreligious propaganda. Books written by soldiers or travelers on the most indifferent topics, scientific articles in encyclopedias, leading articles in journals, play on this pantheistic undertone and interpret everything, from Genesis to the Apocalypse, from the origin of man to his end—all history, science and literature—quite harmoniously with this nebulous theme of man's going back somehow, somewhere, into a great All, where, irresponsible for all he has done, he is lost in light, in the sun, in a "linkage with God", or the like.

PLURALITY OF WORLDS. There is a great deal of humility about all this, when to shake God off, it is thought fitting to make man very little, unassuming, and absorbed by some bigger thing—to make him not less of an accident in the world than any individual ox, ass or gorilla, for which there is no individual providence: *Numquid Deo cura est de bobus?* Reinforcing this sentiment of littleness and lowliness, there comes the discovery of so much clay, metal and gas, scattered about the sky. There are 2000 solar systems which canopy man's night for him, and enlarge his mind, and show him to be in such a small corner that, as the British Prime Minister observed, it seems out of proportion to regard him as anything but an accident here—small by measurement, not large by contemplation. So it is conceived that, in such a plurality of solar systems, there should be a plurality of mankinds, to save all that metal and clay which he is contemplating from being without a witness to contemplate them, or from being without a capitalist to exploit them. The smallness of man's eye is adduced by someone as a proof that the big field of nature was never meant for him to look at, though it is notorious that this very eye is what has seen all that, and is looking out for more. The whole conception of this theory is founded on the fallacy of confounding *majus* with *melius,* the big thing with the better thing. The whole universe of stars which man sees and thinks of is not worth one twinkle of his eye or the flash of a single thought. *"Quoniam videbo coelos tuos, opera digitorum tuorum*—I will behold Thy heavens, the works of Thy fingers, the moon and the stars which Thou hast founded".[28]

[28] Psalm 8:4.

However, with a plurality of mankinds devised as inhabiting a plurality of worlds, there is the shadow of an excuse for turning one's back on all that most concerns the one mankind which is—on the Incarnation, Christ and Christianity. The lowly, little man, who is, may be dismissed as an accident, and an adjective. And, whereas there used to be a psychology which treated of his spiritual and immortal soul, there came in first only a materialistic physiology for his material body; and now, on post-Darwinian lines, both soul and body, psychology and physiology, are thrown into biology with the beasts. This is what is called the "biological view" of life, or human evolution.

MORALITY. Law and commandments having been left out, natural morality too is represented as an accident of conventional manners, or as adjustments in tribes or between them; it is but the code of a compromise or mutual understanding for the sake of living together, when one accommodates the range of his freedom to that of another for peace' sake. The moral law of nature is reduced to civic comity more or less. Otherwise everything is free, love, hate, passions, nature. Morality is as an author quoted above said, loyalty to oneself; it is "wholeness". And, in answer to the suggestion of sin and vice, the rationalist has replied, that sin actual or original is only an ignorance or disregard of the forces of nature; which seems to mean that nature should have been left to itself "wholly," and should not have been meddled with by the law and order of the God who made it.

THE BIBLE. Where rationalism still applies itself to the sacred books, it affects to regard those parts as inspired which touch your feelings, appeal to your sentiments, work on you, and belong to the sphere of what is called "romantic." Religion and its appurtenances belong to "Romanticism". But the fact is that, even with divines of the day, there is not a clear idea to be had of what inspiration is, revelation, infallibility, inerrancy. With some doctors of divinity and others who are not doctors, the Bible which contained all their divinity once has become a field for fun, without exciting a protest. A recent American ambassador to the Court of St. James's[29] addressed an Author's Club in London on the subject: "Have

[29] Mr. G. Harvey, 24 October, 1922.

Women Souls?" He played havoc, flippantly, ignorantly, sophistically, with the book of Genesis, in the style of Ingersoll's lectures, which did so much damage to young men forty years ago.

THE AREA OF TRUTH AND ERROR. Another layman [30] advocating the reunion of opposing parties in religion, thought it would be enough if they threw their contradictory tenets into what he called an "area"; truth lodging there with error, and lying down like the lamb with the lion. This area being possessed in common by all, each would find its own with the rest; and the truth would be somewhere. It is a new form of the old scepticism, saying *Sic et Non,* Yes and No, to anything, adding the persiflage of agreeing with everybody to his face, and laughing at him behind his back. Like the "Common Christianity" mentioned above, it is looking for a common formula to which all may subscribe, while they only mean something particular within the four corners of the formula, all the rest being treated, as with "modern churchmen", to a mental reservation.

Here two strains of thought may be noted incidentally in modern literature. One is the misery of our separated brethren, who do not know what they are to believe. An Anglican layman writes to the press [31] that the churches are so empty nowadays because "the average congregation is not presented with nearly enough theology. The unfortunate experiment of 'bringing down religion to the level of the people' (whatever this may mean), instead of educating people up to the level of religion, is responsible for the prevailing indifference of men and women of good will to spiritual influences. . . . Most of us are totally unable to defend our religion rationally, and it is only the privileged few who live by faith."

The other strain to be noted appears when Catholicism or Scholasticism has to be mentioned. In Scholasticism there is that unpardonable sin—its clearness, logic and positiveness in essentials. Of the Catholic Church at large it was said by a member of Parliament at the time of the Regency bill, that she remains always an object of profound "distrust"—for indeed there is no extricating oneself from the toils of a clear truth

[30] Lord Hugh Cecil.

[31] H. J. Goolden, London *Times,* 7 October, 1924.

and a lucid argument! Better far an "area", to go discovering the truth there, with the franchise of not finding it in a lifetime!—Hence too the convenience of many current terms, which mask contradictories. Thus the "unmoral" teaching, mentioned above, may signify either morality or immorality; and the "loyalty to oneself", or a man's being "whole", as the writer of America expressed it, may mean a whole man or a whole libertine.

TWO POSTULATES. All this style of thought and speech agrees with two postulates of the day, but dating from long ago. The first is as to method. The deists would have it that Christianity is not to be regarded as founded on argument; for instance, miracles and prophecy must not be admitted in corroboration of it. They are to be passed over; and hence the great cry which is always heard, about the laws of nature being unchangeable—as if it were not the same God who made the laws and works the miracle, or, seeing from eternity to eternity, delivers the prophecy. The other postulate is that there is no such thing as a certain statement of truth, with a definition of terms first, and a dogma formulated next. Everything should be left suspended, as you like it, with a *Sic* or a *Non* to grace it. Rationalism considers it out of good form to be positive on anything. Social ways will have it that it is not modest, that it is an assumption, to make a blank, logical assertion on any great matter—as the catechism does on so many things.

PIETISM. It is in this way, and to such like effects, that Pietism leads. There is not a little pietism round about us, and some of it happily seems to conduct good persons into the Church; while, less happily, some of it hangs on still inside of the Church, and may lead to a false mysticism in a contemplative way, or may lead out of the Church in a modernistic way. Professional pietists have been those persons whose piety consists in sentiment; who have religious feelings, but go without "institutional" religion, without the Church—which with its institutions, its deposit of doctrine, Sacraments and authority, is religion in concrete form among men, for men, and in men's own visible way. Some Catholic, who may still have cared for piety, averred of himself that he did not care for formulas of faith; that is, he was a pietistic modernist. Another

Catholic referred to the Sacraments, without calling them by their proper name, as "pious helps", just like an edifying exhortation in life, or a sympathetic shake of the hand at death, or anything else which might just help. Non-Catholic pietism, taking sentiment to be enough, makes much of gush and expansion, of some immediate revelation and conversion; while, at death, one is perfectly correct, passes over, and "all the trumpets sound on the other side." Since the great war, obituary notices *in memoriam* have been rife with this kind of pietistic talk, prompted by the real affection of only a natural piety for relatives or friends. But, pretending to be religious, it is not religion. In pietistic literature, in the standard hymns of sentimental piety, in all the feeling and gush, there is no mention of personal sin, repentance, Sacraments, virtue acquired, perfection practised—all that which every Catholic understands who goes to confession, and which in Catholic theology is called asceticism. This vitality of moral life consists in exercising oneself, in forming self, what in the military sense of drill and manœuvre was called by the ancient Romans, *meditationes*. The sum of true asceticism is the acquisition of virtue at one's own cost, with the help of God's grace, administered through all the means which God's Church provides. An old heretic, Michael de Molinos, made himself notorious for pitching pietistic aims high, even to contemplation, and for living, teaching, corrupting, on a plane abominably low.

MYSTICISM. As the great director Scaramelli says of this very man and his spurious mysticism, "*Quietists* lay out the plan of a false contemplation, and then, to give it credit, they ascribe to it the very nicest attributes of true contemplation".[32] This word "mysticism" is much favored in modern literature. But, in the two prevalent forms which appear, it seems to be a refinement of pietism, to the worst effects of self-deceit. If, under one form it does not mean the same thing as "romanticism"—that historico-literary fiction which is made to comprise in the same religious category Christianity, Mahometanism, Comte and Herbert Spencer—it seems to be only another form or system, not only for skipping over the practice of Christian virtue and evading asceticism which costs too much, but for jumping up cheaply, by sensibility, emotion and ex-

[32] Scaramelli, *Direttorio Mistico*, II, v. 48.

pansion, to some lofty state of absorption or quietism, at no cost to oneself or to a single passion.

MODERNISM. Pius X described modernism as a general collection of heresies, not always taken up and adopted because they are known to be heresies, but oftentimes because they are not known; and the congested state of mind which results is one appealing not to science but to ignorance. In the modernistic assemblage of the *errores serpentes* which we are noticing, and other such notions which happen to fill a vacant mind or serve a fallacious purpose, it seems not at all necessary that the elements of thought be consistent one with another. *Coagulatum est cor eorum.* There is prevalent an inconsistency, in which elements picked up by the mind are not dissolved and absorbed; nor do they combine with one another; but they hang suspended and only mixed or coagulated. We cannot pursue particulars, because they come from all points of the compass, truth the while being only one and in the center.

MATHEMATICAL ANALYSIS. Who could ever have imagined that abstract mathematics would one day enter the field, to the effect of shutting out God from the world? Yet so it has come to pass. Not that Einstein's explorations among the planets, any more than Darwin's observations among plants and animals had much to do with the theorizing which has followed, except so far as he made demands on faith, or assumed postulates which are now openly exploited in favor of atheism. Without pretending to touch the mathematics of this new theory, called "Relativity", we merely register here what a critic favorable to it observes, on the postulates or assumptions of Einstein and his followers.

One assumption or postulate of the physical theory involved is that whatever lay at the beginning of physical things should itself be physical and definable like the rest; that the "ultimate entities of a physical theory should be definable in terms of physical processes." This physical postulate or assumption, which is to be granted before an equation has been formulated, looks innocent; but, in fact, it has got rid of God before the manipulator has begun to operate at all. For God existing really and physically, if you like, at the very beginning of things as their first cause, is not in our physical order; the postulate has subtly invaded the metaphysical order, and begs

to deny God there because it cannot define Him here, as one of the many things which He has created. So the friendly critic expressly says, that hereby are ruled out "those attributes of God [*almighty power, wisdom,* etc.,] from which some of the old writers on dynamics [*all Christianity, even paganism and philosophy*] derived the laws of nature [*as the creation of God*]". All this divine science of nature is cancelled by a preliminary stroke of the pen, in the form of an assumption or postulate.

Another postulate, equally gratuitous and similarly abused, is that of asking for some structure in existence, without saying where it is to come from, whether by the "law of chance" or otherwise. Then mathematics and its equations, which are here called "the mind's creative action on this raw material" of structure, will build up the whole world and govern it, without any reference to a first cause or a final cause or divine government between. It is the blankest idealism of mathematical equations, which have no more to do, and much less, with making or governing the world than the playing of a piano has to do with the poising of the spheres. Yet, with the characteristic mentality of our times, the critic, understanding nothing, says these things expressly: "It appears that, provided that *structure,* almost the most general conceivable, may be postulated for the fundamental entities of the universe, then the world we know is a consequence of the mind's creative action on this raw material". And to show that he means what he says, he goes on to admit that "not everything in the physical universe has yet been derived as a mathematical consequence of a general relation-structure".[33]

III. Phrases.

In the foregoing section we have endeavored to purify the eye in reading, to discern the substance of the errors which creep about and creep in, and so reckon with them as men who know some literary currents of the day. It is proper to note also the phrases used, which in a brief form contain a world of error, *multum in parvo,* masking what they convey, disguising things and throwing a spectral haze about what they touch, as we have just seen in the case of the critic on Einstein's

[33] *The Times* (London), Literary Supplement, 25 September, 1924, p. 587 on Weyl, Eddington, etc., Einstein's followers.

mathematics. Phrases have this quality about them that, when often used and dinned into our ears, they enslave the mind, which perhaps has never heard the meaning defined.

Such is "unsectarian Christianity"; people may come to believe there is such a thing. "Sacramental" is a term in favor with a certain class of modernists and pietists, who fling the term about on anything—a blooming flower, or a weeping willow.

We hear of "creative theology". We heard during the great war of "creative justice". The one means that some new, odd notion makes the law for divinity by the fact of its being propounded; the other signifies that the fact of a deed being perpetrated lays down the law for a new kind of justice. At present we hear of "creative prayer", purporting to mean that prayer is only an auto-suggestion in the line of psychoanalysis, to wit, that the idea of "God" is raised in a mental "complex" of "Father", and then prayer issues forth to greet the complex so conjured up. "Self-creative reality" is another phrase of no meaning whatever; it is taken to signify the contradiction of a nothing getting itself up to be a something without any cause to do that for it. By the use of the word, "Transcendental", God is made to float into view like a mist of the morning, and to float out of view like the mist at noonday.

"Altruism", or the proposition that we should mind others, would fain inhibit us from minding ourselves and looking to our own salvation; for that would be egotism, not the gospel of altruism. "Medieval conceits", and other such terms equally presumptuous, are taken up and supposed to dispatch the Bible as well as most things which thus far have been sacred even to Protestantism. "The failure of Christianity" means the failure of people to practise Christianity; "the backwardness of Christian nations" signifies that Christianity is not forward in making good profits out of cash invested. "Dark Ages", "Barbarous Ages", are names for the ages of faith, when the Church, the clergy and the monks were forming the nations, and did impart to them their civilization. "Mysticism", "magic", "priestcraft", "folk-lore", are terms bandied about without apology for religion, prayer, Sacraments, revelation. It is noteworthy how the most sacred words of the Divinity

and of our religious liturgy are subtly applied to the rites and superstitions of the lamas in Thibet; reverence for the Saints and their relics is confused with the fetish worship of idolatry.

In an issue at the present moment between an anti-clerical government and the solid mass of Catholics in Alsace and Lorraine, the religious spirit of the people which refuses to be browbeaten and trampled on is called the "temporal power of the clergy"; and such "temporal power" calls at once for high-handed action on the part of the secularist government. And the word "justice" is used to authorize the violence of persecution, because, the rest of France having had its Catholicity despoiled of property and ground down, it is said that Alsace and Lorraine should be treated similarly "in justice"!

Singular is the ingenuity exercised in employing language and culture, talents and opportunities, temporal means and great organs of publicity, to shirk law, through every chink and door to assail the idea of a Lawgiver, and to try to do with God what He does with the impious, "hold the corners of the earth and shake the wicked out of it".[34] One school, that of John Stuart Mill, found such a door in the mere existence of physical evil; others, in the idea of human will and liberty, to the effect then by mere phrase and sneer of denying, of decrying, of disowning responsibility for the abuse of free will and of everything that makes a man. Plain matters are pronounced to be insoluble problems, or questions "too complex"; and that serves the purpose of shelving or smothering religion. The errors and faults of Christians, especially of churchmen and dignitaries, being held up as in St. Jerome's time: *Num mea peccata virtutes tuae sunt?* are taken to be an ample justification for improving the situation, for passing by the Church of God and her declaration of divine law, and ignoring everything that she teaches in the name of God.

To conclude these preliminaries with a sentiment like that with which we began, on being of the same mind with the Catholic and hierarchical Church, we may say with St. Thomas, that piety, which is a virtue toward our natural father, is a gift of the Holy Ghost toward God our Father, and makes us sensitive and tender toward everything that is His, or bears on Him. Hence those directive criteria which we enumerated

[34] Job, 38: 13.

above. And we add thereto with St. Thomas a dictum of St. Augustine: Never to contradict Holy Scripture, whether we penetrate its meaning or not.[35]

THOMAS HUGHES, S.J.

Rome, Italy.

FATHER JUVENIS INVESTS IN RADIO.

IT isn't often I get a chance to write as I would like, and many times when the leisure for it somehow comes and I get a moment's respite from my labors in the parish here at St. John's, the inspiration is lacking and I have nothing to write about. But to-day, for reasons I cannot explain, I seem to have both. And I say "seem" advisedly, for perhaps I will not get far before either one or the other will run out. The inspiration is the trickier of the two; for, though I like to write and enjoy a keen sense of satisfaction when I see my own very thoughts smiling (or glaring, sometimes) up at me from the typewritten page (yes; I might as well admit it; Father Juvenis has at last persuaded me to invest in one of those Portable machines) . . . what was I saying? Yes, though I like to write, it is only too often, as Mark Twain says, that I run out of gas, almost without warning, and find myself just putting down a lot of words. *Vox et praeterea nihil!* Or again, if it is not the inspiration which is lacking, it is quite sure to be the time. I used to think I was the most overworked man in the diocese before my assistant came; but as I view things now, the old days were the days of leisure in comparison. But don't mistake me: I do not mean that Father Juvenis is not on the job. He is a regular sponge for work; he is saturated with it and yet never seems to know when he has had enough.

No doubt, if the truth were told, I would have to admit that I now work harder than I used to, simply in order, humanly speaking of course, to keep from feeling ashamed of myself when I look at him and see all that he does. Being a Pastor Antiquus, I am, I suppose, of the old school, and possess a fault common to both the old and the new "school" in many cases: procrastination. But since Father Juvenis came here nearly a year ago and ran that now famous Garden Party of ours last May, I have been overcoming my tendency to put off till

[35] St. Thomas, *Summa Theol.*, 2a, 2ae,, q.121, a.1, ad 3[m].

to-morrow what I could as easily do to-day. The old crow is not so often heard in this neighborhood crying: "*Cras! Cras!*" Nowadays I never suggest that I have a slight headache on the Women's Sodality Night, and so hint at giving them a short session, for I know Juvenis will at once offer to take my place. Thank God, the Bishop sent him, for I am now a more zealous priest.

But how I wander! 'Twas not so much of my own spiritual improvement that I meant to write when I began, as of my Curate's latest permission he has succeeded in wheedling out of me. Even before he came I had the idea that I'd have to hold him down. He wasn't in the house an hour when I knew it. Not two hours before I was determined to stick to my guns and run the parish myself. And not three months before, I had given in to him and sacrificed one of my pet ideas, to wit, that all Garden Parties were outrageous and should never be held in *my* parish. That story I have told you. What do you think his latest is? *Radio!*

The debate began one evening after supper. We had come up to my study, according to custom, to enjoy a cigar together. I was at my desk looking over some afternoon mail and he sat in the big armchair, taking an occasional whiff of his cigar and mooning off into space, silent.

"Blue?" I asked.

"Yes," he answered with a slight start; "Odd, isn't it? The smoke from the end of the cigar is blue; that from the mouth grey. They say it's the great amount of moisture . . . "

"No, no!" I corrected. "I was asking if *you* are blue. You seem so abstracted there, gazing off into space, out into the empty air, where nothing is . . . "

"Nothing, indeed!" cried Father Juvenis. "Why, Father Sicdixi [he doesn't call me that, of course: that's only my name when I write of myself] don't you know that '*The Air is Full of Things You Shouldn't Miss*'?"

"Young man, you have been reading the Radio advertisements," I accused.

"I certainly have! Got the *Radio Broadcast* and *Popular Radio* the other day when I was in the city and have enjoyed reading every period and comma in them. I have a couple of the other Radio magazines too, but they don't seem to be much. These two are O. K. Scientific, yet understandable

and evidently sincerely the friends of the Radio Fan. I like them and intend to subscribe for both."

"Do you subscribe for the '*Ecclesiastical*'? It seems to me it would be much more useful."

I enjoy an opportunity like that: it comes seldom and departs soon, for he always has his answer. He grinned.

"I know," admitted he, "but it is for my education and I always find it on your library table; but the *Broadcast* and the *Popular*—they are for my entertainment . . . and yours too, Father dear," he added quickly. "I shall be glad to leave them on the library table too."

"Rubbish!"

"Now, now, Father!"

"I tell you they are! I think it's a shame to have a Catholic priest wasting his time on Radio, whether it be with its dilettante scientific literature or with the fad itself, when there are so many things he could read up in Theology. Shucks! How out of proportion we get in these days. Why man, think of the questions of Moral Theology on which every priest grows rusty and needs polishing up. Hang the Radio! Spend your time usefully!"

I meant every word I said.

Father Juvenis seemed somewhat taken aback, and for a moment I thought I had him. But only for a moment, for presently he said:

"Yes, that's right . . . for instance, '*communicatio in divinis*' might be the thing to brush up in all its details. Since Radio came into popularity and the Protestant churches have begun to broadcast their services, the question of listening-in seems to have its moral side all right. It was only last week that old Mr. Mulligan asked me when I stopped in to see him: 'Father,' said he, 'Glory be to God, I'm getting to be quite a Protestant. When there's nothing else going, I chune in on the Reverend Mr. Whitehall Thwaite's sermons and grand organ recitals. The music is elegant. But, Father, is it a sin to listen to them Protestant sermons?' Those are his very words. Now, Father, what would you have answered?"

"Well," I stalled, "what did you answer?"

"I didn't answer. Just then his daughter came in, made some remark, and the dear old man forgot all about it. I was glad he did. True enough, we'll have to talk that over, won't we? Now what do you think?"

"I think," said I hotly, "that here is only another instance of this confounded Radio doing harm. It is not only inane, but positively harmful. Old Mulligan, who would drop dead in his tracks before he'd enter a Protestant church—even for a funeral of a friend, I bet—listening to a Protestant sermon and calling the music elegant! It's a shame and an invention of the devil! That's what I think!"

"Good gracious, Father," smiled Juvenis, "but I'd hate to go to confession to you, if I had done what Mr. Mulligan has. And I have done it too. I've listened-in on the Rev. Mr. Thwaite."

I eyed him narrowly to see if he was joking. He wasn't.

"I know, Father, but you didn't do it as an act of worship. You knew your Theology and could distinguish between . . . you know what I mean."

"Surely," said Juvenis considerately, "I understand. Neither did Mr. Mulligan perform any act of worship. It is at least doubtful if he was even morally present at the services. At least, I say this arguing from the analogy of absolution over the telephone and from the fact that some bishops will not permit dispensations to be granted over the 'phone. Fact is, I believe old Mulligan must have wearily waited out the sermon just in order to enjoy the singing and organ that go with it. Subjectively, certainly not; objectively, quite surely there was no sin in what he did."

"No."

"But you take my case. And it's not a bit different from that of many other Catholics who listen-in on a Protestant sermon of the every Sunday type. I was actuated mainly by a spirit of curiosity. Human nature likes to hear and not be seen. I wanted to find out if Thwaite was the good preacher he is reputed to be. He is. I mean he is a born orator and a master of rhetoric. He has all the tricks of the trade. I learned many things about preaching from the Rev. Mr. Thwaite, including one severe object lesson—that I who preach the truth of God must do at least as much as he does to dress

that word of God in the finest clothes I can make for it; to do at least as much as he does to make our people go out of Saint John's feeling, if they do not say it, that mine was a good interesting sermon."

My own interest was warming.

"That's a good lesson indeed that you learned, Father, and I shall take it to heart myself. But here is the trouble: *you* could learn that lesson, whereas other Catholics, led at first if you will by curiosity, then attracted and held by the preacher's native ability, will be rendered, as Cicero says, 'benevoli,' and so very likely be willing to accept some of the *doctrine* the man preaches. Why, I understand that recently in New York City they were broadcasting heretical sermons and inter-pulpit debates on the question of the Virgin Birth. How can any ordinary Catholic listen to these things and not take harm? We ought to forbid them to do it. And forbid them in every case, since they have not the training to distinguish the harmful from the harmless or indifferent or the accidentally true. Faith is a divine gift and that man violates the natural law who wilfully exposes it even to probable ruin."

"Oh, of course," said Juvenis, "there are some cases where it would be intrinsically wrong for Catholics to take any chances with their faith. That is true enough independently of the question of listening-in on the Radio. Yet I do not believe that a Catholic runs any such risk by listening to a Protestant sermon broadcast. They may be curious; they may even be charmed by the preacher's oratory; but their whole attitude is against the acceptance of a single shred of the doctrine he proposes. If they hear things they know to be true because their priests have taught them the same, they rejoice that the Protestant has at least that much of the truth. If they hear things they know to be false, they pity the unbeliever. If they hear things of which they are doubtful, they immediately bristle all over and will not accept the doctrine. In fact, accidentally they may be thus urged to come to you or me and find out the truth in the matter, and thus be positively benefited in a manner they would otherwise have missed altogether."

"Humph!" I grunted, "that may be true. But . . . Say, Father, do you suppose there is much of this thing? Do many Catholics listen to Protestant services broadcast?"

"I believe that with exceptions there is actually very little of it. The popular mind toward Radio is that it is primarily entertainment. In a recent issue of *Popular Radio* there was an article against what the writer calls the usurpation of the air by the churches. You understand, all receiving sets are not equally selective, that is, if very close to a broadcasting station they easily tune out an undesirable station. Now it seems that one station on Staten Island has come in for a lot of criticism because they insist on inflicting Bible Lessons on the public at a time when they want jazz. So you see, not all Protestants, let alone Catholics, are looking for religious broadcasting. Again, I believe we can form some sort of a judgment from the evident consciences of our people themselves, those I mean who actually have from time to time listened to a Protestant service. Rarely do they think they have done wrong. To them it was a kind of a lark. From their whole attitude we may judge that they are not looking for the thing, that they sometimes tolerate it for the sake of the bit of entertainment they can get out of the music, that they are good Catholics still."

"Yes," I agreed, "that seems a sound conclusion. But tell me, for you seem to have given the matter thought. What do you intend to tell people when they ask your advice about it. What will you tell old Mr. Mulligan if he asks you again?"

"Why, I'll generally dissuade people from doing it. I'll ask them if they don't think they could get more profit out of reading if there's nothing else on the air but a Protestant service. They'll agree with me and be satisfied. Some of course will go farther and want to know if it is a sin, like Mulligan. To such I will answer with another question, in true Irish form: 'Do you mean to join the Protestant service as much as you can as an act of worship?' They will then be horrified, so I'll then strike home with: 'Well, *that would* be sinful; but I thought you bought your Radio for entertainment. Didn't you? . . . Yes? . . . Well then, tune in on *Roxy and His Gang* and be entertained: they're on the air every Sunday evening from 7.20 till 9." And I'll let it go at that, in most cases."

"Good! I wouldn't be a bit surprised if that's the way in which the new editions of the Moral books will handle the

matter. Good! That is . . . " and I paused to chose my words carefully. I then continued: ". . . it is a good solution as far as it goes and is complete enough for one who has had training in Moral Theology; but I really think that you ought to impress your inquirers with the truth of this fact also —that there is actually some danger in lightly listening-in on the Protestant services. This or that listener may be personally strong enough in his faith, but if he feels that he is free to listen to these sermons, that it's 'all right' to do so, he may absorb something of that spirit so strong in our day of indifferentism in matters of religion. Only recently I was reading of a Protestant minister who boasted of the fact that he had twenty-some different denominations represented in his congregation and he went on to say that he defied any man 'to tell the difference one from another even with the aid of the most powerful microscope'. Father, I think I would tell anyone who asked my advice, that unless the reason for listening-in on a Protestant service were merely curiosity, and unless it were done only rarely, the thing would be dangerous and ought to be stopped. I'd say that I think it is at least disloyal and at worst dangerous because of the spirit of the times. It is only too easy to pick up little shreds of it, like lint on the clothing, until at length one might easily find his true Catholicity quite dusty indeed. Don't you think I'm right?"

"You surely are, Father!" agreed Father Juvenis readily. "There's nothing more disgusting than the diluted, milk-and-water type of Catholic. He is always temporizing. He claims to be broad-minded and a good-fellow. Truth is, he is full of human respect and readily concedes points where concession is disastrous. Truly, as you say, there is some danger for this type of Catholic in listening-in on the Protestant services."

"Yes; and so it's our plain duty to protect this kind against the harm they may do to themselves. But, say," I continued, "I wonder what results the ministers get from their broadcasting efforts? Can you tell me anything about that? Are their efforts appreciated by those for whom they are intended to be of service? It seems to me to be a kind of confession of weakness on the part of the Protestant churches. They are reversing the Eastern proverb: the mountain will not come

to Mahomet, so Mahomet is going to the mountain. I wonder if they feel that the Radio is the only way they can get certain people to 'come to church', and so have taken this means of enlarging their congregations? Most of all I am curious to know how the Radio congregation likes what it gets and just how much they want what they get. I wonder."

"I know the answer, Father," said Juvenis promptly. "I was perplexed with the same questions myself recently, and learned the answer only the other evening when Father Corcoran and I were listening to the Reverend Mr. Thwaite. He is a Scotch Presbyterian. Before he began his sermon he made several announcements, among which were several letters he had received from various broadcast listeners in all parts of the east and middle west. Not one but was enthusiastic in praise of the preacher for his eloquence, grateful in thanks to both God and him for the wonderful good he was doing by broadcasting his services for them every Sunday night. They were all better men and women, they averred, since they had begun to go to church in the air.

"Now, Father," he went on, "I haven't any doubt but that he and many others have done great good to many people to whom no one else ever would do good, so that it is not surprising that he gets letters from all quarters begging him to keep on. The question of attending 'divine service' through a pair of ear-phones or a loud speaker rather than by actual bodily presence in the church is not a serious one for your Protestant broadcast preacher, for he realizes that he has no authority to compel the bodily presence anyway. He therefore, in his zeal, is only too glad, as you put it, to enlarge his congregation through the air. Oh yes; both Radio preacher and Radio-preached-at are glad of their opportunity —though not the *whole* Radio public, as I believe; witness the complaint in the magazine I just mentioned.

"Well, now, what do you think was the most surprising announcement that the Rev. Mr. Thwaite made that evening? You'd never guess who one of his listeners has been for some time. Let me whisper it: a Catholic priest! I don't know his name, but Thwaite was saying: 'And brethren, I hope our sermons over the Radio will continue to do good. I hope they will make you all better, whoever and whatever you are. I

hope they will make all Presbyterians better Presbyterians; I hope they will make all Methodists and Lutherans better Methodists and Lutherans; I hope they will make all Jews better Jews and make them love and attend their synagogues more faithfully: yes, and I hope that the Catholics who are listening-in will be better Catholics too. For there are Catholics who listen to my sermons over the Radio. Recently a friend of mine gave me a beautiful little poem written by a priest friend of his after he had heard one of our services. It was a delicate bit of verse and so appreciative that I wrote to the author and thanked him sincerely and received a very nice note in reply. It is things like this that will draw us all more closely together. And so I thank the Father.' Those are his words as well as I can recall them. Now what do you think of that, Father Sicdixi?"

I had been listening with open mouth. I had even suspected my sometimes facetious Assistant of joking again. He must have seen my incredulity, for he hastened to assure me that these things were actual facts.

"Well then," I answered finally, "it just goes to show that I was only too right! When our own priests begin to encourage heretics to teach the people, we are indeed at a higher pitch of religious indifferentism than I ever suspected. I know, of course, that this good priest was perhaps only sentimental and is not really an indifferentist; but surely I think he is carrying his broadmindedness quite too far. Catholics who heard Mr. Thwaite's story of the priest's poem can hardly be blamed if they should think it quite right in every way to listen-in on the Protestant services. In their minds it can be in no way wrong or even dangerous, if their priest praises the minister for doing it. I hope none of *our* parishioners heard of that, or we'll have a nice time building up the fences after the dear priest-poet! So it was at Father Corcoran's you heard the Reverend Mr. Thwaite preach, was it?"

"Yes, Father. He has a dandy Superheterodyne. I was on a sick-call out his way and thought I'd drop in on him. Poor fellow, he doesn't see many of his brethren of the cloth very often. He's not well and can't get around himself as he'd like, and has a large territory besides. I tell you, Father, Radio is a blessing for him. He tells me he can sit in his

library and travel all over the United States by simply twisting a couple of dials. In fact to Europe. He picked up England in the international tests. Some set!"

"How much did it cost him?"

"What! Can I believe my ears? I say, I think you are interested!"

"No; only curious, young man!"

"Well, I can tell you, for I'm up on the prices. Corcoran has a Radiola Super, which sells at $269.00. He paid a good deal less, for his brother is in the business and let him have it at cost. Now when I get . . . Pardon me! I haven't yet asked your permission, have I? Father, will you agree to let me have one here, say, in the library?"

"By no means! Not in my library! You can put anything in your own room you please, barring your car. Before I knew it, you'd have me listening to Protestant sermons! No sir!"

"But Father . . . "

"Young man: No!"

"I know you'd like it. Think of the *World Series* coming in, play by play! Think of the *New York Philharmonic Orchestra* in your very home! Think of the *Everready Entertainers!* Think of the President of the United States talking right into your own ear, confidentially, as it were! Think of . . . Why, Father, it's no wonder that priests stay at home more now than they ever did. It's no wonder that formerly grouchy and off-the-job country pastors without a curate, now wear a smile and miss all kinds of trips to town just to stay home and hear the wonderful things in the air. You're passing up a lot, Father Sicdixi, Sir!"

I reached for my check-book. He stopped me.

"No, Father! No! That was not the reason I wanted permission to put the thing in the library. This is going to be my treat. In fact, I'm going to build it myself according to specifications in the *Popular Radio*, Cockaday's latest Superheterodyne."

"Oh, I know you weren't holding out for the money, Father. But I do want to help. I know that wasn't your reason—but let me help. No, of course, that couldn't have been *your* reason. But bless me, what *could* have been your reason, anyway?" I asked with a smile.

"Well, I might as well be honest and give you the real reason. I wanted it in the library because I couldn't enjoy it alone. Our recreations are always so pleasant, that as crazy as I am for a Radio, I wouldn't want it or anything else that might . . . you know."

I have seldom seen my Father Juvenis blush. But he was blushing now, and I tell you I was that flattered and proud of him that I enjoyed seeing him blush. Say, how I love that Assistant of mine! Why, I wouldn't part with him for . . . Aw, but say . . . there I go, getting sentimental myself. Anyway, I guess you can see what I am like and what he is like: first I fight him and then find that he wins again! God bless me! I must be a funny fellow. No doubt, I'm getting old!"

PASTOR ANTIQUUS.

Analecta

S. POENITENTIARIA APOSTOLICA.

(Sectio de Indulgentiis.)

Decretum: De Normis in concedenda et lucranda Indulgentia Portiunculae.

Ut septimi pleni saeculi ab condito feliciter amplissimo Minorum Ordine et memoria et fructus quam diutissime permanerent, fel. rec. Pius Pp. X, Litteris motu proprio die IX mensis iunii anni MDCCCCX datis, benigne concessit, ut eo ipso dumtaxat saeculari anno, Portiunculae Indulgentia, quam vocant, ad alias proferri posset ecclesias atque oratoria, quae de Ordine Minorum non essent, necessarias atque opportunas ad rem facultates singulis locorum Ordinariis tribuendo.

Verum, id per insequentem annum, cum eiusdem indulgentiae lucrandae dies haud longe abesset, evenit, ut ad Supremam S. Officii Congregationem, cui tum munus moderandarum indulgentiarum incumberet, innumerabiles undique perferrentur libelli, quibus postulabatur, placeret Apostolicae Sedi, aut indulta ante a quovis data prorogare aut nova eius generis largiri, ut, quo praestantissimo ecclesiis sane multis frui licuerat beneficio, id deinde postea fruendum consisteret. Iamvero Emi ac Rmi PP. Inquisitores Generales, cum sibi visum esset Christi fidelium vota posse utiliter admitti atque expleri, censuerunt certas quasdam leges praestitui oportere, ad quas Indulgentia

Portiunculae in posterum concederetur. Ne tamen Ecclesiae filii, usquedum eiusmodi lege conderentur, tam insigni beneficio carerent, iidem Emi Patres, decreto die XXVI mensis maii anni MDCCCCXI lato, quod tamdiu valeret quoad aliquid aliud decerneretur, concessiones antea factas facultatesque Ordinariis locorum tributas sine die prorogarunt.

Opus a S. Congregatione S. Officii inchoatum Sacra Poenitentiaria Apostolica, cuius nunc est indulgentiarum concessionem usumque moderari, perficiendum cum sibi pro munere suo sumpsisset, re accurate perpensa, haec, quae sequuntur, ad Indulgentiam Portiunculae quod attinet, in posterum servanda esse decrevit:

I. Ut veneratio, qua Assisiense de Portiuncula Sacellum fideles prosequuntur, nihil unquam capiat detrimenti, immo etiam cotidie magis augeatur, in nulla ecclesia nulloque oratorio, vel Franciscalis cuiuslibet Instituti, quod a memorato Sacello minus distet quam infra n. V praescribitur, haec Indulgentia altero die mensis augusti lucrifieri in posterum queat, etsi id antehac licuit, nisi ab iis tantum qui domum ecclesiae vel oratorio continentem incolant, modo tamen aut physice aut moraliter impediantur quominus ad idem Portiunculae Sacellum se conferant.

II. Perpetuae huius Indulgentiae concessiones, adhuc quoquo modo factae, integrae in posterum sunto, ea tamen condicione, ut normae, hoc decreto futuris concessionibus moderandis statutae, omnino serventur, si eam unice excipias quae ad distantiam pertinet.

III. Indulta omnia temporaria, scilicet aut ad certum tempus aut sine die aut ad beneplacitum a quovis legitime concessa, inde a die XXXI mensis decembris vertente anno abrogata habeantur ac cessent. Quodsi nova in futurum indulta alicunde postulari contingat, libelli, ad Sacram Poenitentiariam mittendi, ratio non habebitur, nisi Ordinarius loci preces commendet omnibusque perpensis de vera concessionis opportunitate atque utilitate testificetur.

IV. Si quando privilegium huius Indulgentiae largiendum sit, aedes sacrae praeferantur, quae B. Mariae Virgini Angelorum vel Francisco Assisiensi dicatae sint aut in quibus aliqua sedem habeat e Confraternitatibus seraphicis; quae aedes sicubi desint, templa cathedralia vel parochialia ceteris plerumque anteponantur.

V. Ecclesiae vel publica oratoria ut privilegio hoc locupletentur, distent oportet tria, ut vocant, chilometra ab aliis ecclesiis vel oratoriis quae ad aliquem Franciscalem Ordinem pertineant aut eodem privilegio fruantur.

VI. Si qua peculiari de causa haec Indulgentia semipublicis oratoriis concedenda videatur, eadem unquam ne faveat nisi communitati vel coetui fidelium, in cuius commodum oratoria illa erecta sint.

VII. Ordinariis locorum, parochis et ipsis rectoribus aedium sacrarum, in quibus privilegium insit, facultas esto, si quidem iustis de causis id expedire iudicarint, pro altero mensis augusti die, qui dominicus non sit, substituendi, ad Indulgentiam lucrandam, diem dominicum proxime insequentem.

VIII. In iisdem ecclesiis vel oratoriis, quamdiu, ex praescripto, invisentibus, Indulgentiae acquirendae causa, fidelibus patebunt, tamdiu Reliquiae S. Francisci Assisiensis vel B. Mariae Virginis, aut saltem Imago vel statua eiusdem Sancti vel B. Mariae Virginis Angelorum, venerationi fidelium propositae maneant. Publicae praeterea preces ibidem pro Summo Pontifice universaque militanti Ecclesia, pro haeresum exstirpatione peccatorumque conversione, pro pace et concordia omnium populorum, Deo adhibeantur, quo tempore id fieri opportunius videbitur; sacerque iste ritus, praemissis tum B. Mariae Virginis Angelorum et Seraphici Patriarchae invocatione, tum Litaniis Sanctorum, Eucharistica benedictione absolvatur.

IX. Qui Indulgentiam Portiunculae lucrari cupiat, is admissa sua confiteatur, ab iisque, si opus sit, absolutus, sacra de altari libet; ecclesiam vel oratorium, privilegio ditata, invisat precesque ad mentem Summi Pontificis de more fundat, idest saltem sexies *Pater, Ave* et *Gloria* in unaquaque earum visitationum, quas ad indulgentiam iterum iterumque impetrandam rite peragat.

X. Altero mensis augusti die vel die dominico proxime insequenti, condicionibus superiore n. IX statutis eos quoque stare oportet, si velint Indulgentiae compotes fieri, qui reliquis per annum diebus eo fruuntur indulto, ut sola sex *Pater, Ave* et *Gloria* recitatione, praeter alias, etiam Portiunculae Indulgentiam lucrari queant.

Quae quidem omnia Ssmus Dominus Noster Pius divina Providentia Pp. XI, in audientia die XVI mensis maii subscripto Cardinali Poenitentiario Maiori impertita, adprobavit promulgarique iussit. Contrariis quibuslibet, etiam specialissima atque individua mentione dignis, minime obstantibus.

Datum Romae ex Aedibus Sacrae Poenitentiariae, die x mensis iulii, anno MDCCCCXXIV.

O. CARD. GIORGI, *Poenitentiarius Maior.*

Silvius Fagiolo,
S. Poenit. Apost. a Secretis.

DIARIUM ROMANAE CURIAE.

PONTIFICAL APPOINTMENTS.

21 March: Messrs. David Dell Kieff and John William Hogan, of the Diocese of Ogdensburg, commanders of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class.

31 March: Mr. James D. McCormack, of the Diocese of Vancouver, Knight of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class.

1 April: Mr. John Byrider, of the Diocese of Cleveland, Knight of the Order of Pius.

1 April: Mr. Patrick Henry Rahilly, of the Diocese of Winona, Knight of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class.

Studies and Conferences.

Questions, the discussion of which is for the information of the general reader of the Department of Studies and Conferences, are answered in the order in which they reach us. The Editor cannot engage to reply to inquiries by private letter.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:

S. PENITENTIARY APOSTOLIC, through its department of Indulgences, publishes a decree that sets forth the regulations to be followed in the granting and the gaining of the Portiuncula Indulgence.

ROMAN CURIA announces officially some recent Pontifical honors.

CAN THE MARRIAGE OF TWO DOUBTFULLY BAPTIZED NON-CATHOLICS BE DISSOLVED "QUOAD VINCULUM"?

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

In the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW (January, 1924, pages 59-66 and February, 1925, pages 186-188), Dr. Donovan answers the above question in the affirmative, in virtue of Canon 1127: "In re dubia privilegium fidei gaudet favore juris", as well as in virtue of the decree of the Holy Office of 5 November, 1924. He plainly declares: "Either before or after 1918 two doubtfully baptized non-Catholics are to be considered *in favorem fidei* as having only a *matrimonium legitimum*;" which can be dissolved *quoad vinculum*. If this viewpoint were true, Dr. Donovan would have rightly said: "Canon 1127 becomes a veritable razor for marriage difficulties growing out of conversions to the faith from among our non-Catholics." And as a matter of fact, nowadays the doubtful legitimate unions among non-Catholics are as numerous as divorce. How much simpler then would be the matter of conversion, if a doubtfully baptized non-Catholic could enter upon a new union after his divorce! But unfortunately, it appears to me, the view of Dr. Donovan is neither intrinsically nor extrinsically probable, and hence it is not applicable in practice.

In the first place this view is not probable extrinsically, for,

1. *Not a single authentic decision* can be summoned in its favor. The decision of the Holy Office, 5 November, 1924, quoted on page 188 of the February number of the REVIEW, is indeed of great weight for other considerations, but it absolutely does not prove that the marriage of two doubtfully baptized non-Catholics can be dissolved. For, in the special instance to which the Holy Office refers, the question is concerned with the union between a *non-baptized person* and a baptized Anglican; hence, not with the union between two doubtfully baptized non-Catholics. From another point of view this decision is of great importance, as it proves the view of many theologians,[1] namely, that the union between a baptized and a non-baptized person is merely a *matrimonium legitimum* and not a sacrament; for the Church cannot dispense one from the bond of a *matrimonium consummatum,* which is a sacrament.

2. Formerly some authorities held the same opinion as Dr. Donovan; but at the present time the opposite view is certainly the *sententia communissima.* Vermeersch, the original propounder of Dr. Donovan's view, now teaches the contrary.[2] Likewise decisively against Dr. Donovan are Creusen,[3] Arendt, De Becker, De Smet, and many others. In favor of Dr. Donovan's view are, as far as I know, Cerato[4] and Mgr. Schaepmann.[5] Blat and Capello, who do not even mention this case, are wrongly cited in favor of the opinion. It is evident that a view which has not even a single Roman decision in its favor and but a few authors, and which on the contrary has the *sententia communissima* against it, possesses no *probabilitas externa* to justify its application in a matter of such great importance as that in which the validity of the marriage bond is concerned.

But is the deficiency of the *probabilitas externa* supplied by a solid *probabilitas interna*? I think this also must be denied. The main argument of Dr. Donovan is Canon 1127. This Canon however proves nothing. Ergo.

[1] Cf. the writer's *Manuale Theol. Mor.,* III, n. 649.
[2] *Periodica,* tom. XIII, 1925, p. 212.
[3] *Nouvelle Revue Théologique,* Avril, 1925, 227-242.
[4] *De matr.* n. 127.
[5] *Ned. Kath. Stemmen,* 1925 p. 58.

Canon 1127: "In re dubia privilegium fidei gaudet favore juris" is in no wise new. Of this Dr. Donovan could have convinced himself, had he consulted the sources attached to the Canon. Nearly two hundred years ago Benedict XIV wrote: "In re dubia in favorem fidei pronunciandum esse, constans regula est."[6] In spite of this "constans regula" which has stood for centuries, *no one* has taken it in the view of Dr. Donovan as applicable to the marriage of two doubtfully baptized non-Catholics, even though its application would have so greatly simplified matters. Is it justifiable then to give to a century-old law of the Roman Curia a new interpretation, and that based upon nothing more than purely private authority? Canon 1127 proves nothing whatsoever for Dr. Donovan's thesis.

Further, the new Code contains the old law: "Baptismus dubius in ordine ad matrimonium censetur validus"; and Canon 1070 § 2 confirms it in the following words: "Si baptismus erat dubius, standum est ad normam Canon 1014, pro valore matrimonii, donec certo probetur alteram partem baptizatam esse, alteram vero non baptizatam." In Canon 1014 just referred to, it is expressly stated: "Matrimonium gaudet favore juris; quare in dubio standum est pro valore matrimonii, donec contrarium probetur, salvo praescripto c. 1127." From this it follows that, so long as the doubtful baptism of both non-Catholics cannot with moral certainty be proved invalid, their marriage is valid and must be considered as a sacrament. Now, should the Church, when such a union is broken, dissolve it *quoad vinculum*, she would dissolve a "matrimonium consummatum christianorum"—a thing unheard of, and in direct contradiction to the decree of the Council of Trent, sess. 24 de matr., Canon 2; and likewise to Canon 1118 of the Code, where we read: "Matrimonium validum ratum et consummatum nulla humana potestate nullaque causa praeterquam morte, dissolvi potest."

From these short remarks the conclusion follows evidently that the opinion of Dr. Donovan is unsafe in practice; and that the Church authorities, as they have never put it into practice in the past, will most probably never employ it in the future.

DOM. PRÜMMER, O.P.

University of Fribourg, Switzerland.

[6] *Epist. ad Guglielmi*, § 27, 15 December, 1751, *Bullar.* III, p. 340, ed Prati.

PAULINE PRIVILEGE AND DOUBTFUL BAPTISM.

It has been a constant rule, writes Benedict XIV, in doubtful matters to pronounce in favor of the faith and on this ground he declares legitimate the administration of baptism to a child presented by its grandmother in spite of the mother's opposition.[1] Canonists see an implicit application of this principle in various ancient canons, as, for example, in the decrees of the fourth Council of Toledo (633, Can. 59-66) prescribing, under certain conditions, the separation of baptized children or wives from their Jewish parents or husbands and regulating the relations of Christians with Jews.

In more recent times the Roman Congregations have frequently referred to this same principle in the solution of marriage cases. The Holy Office permits, *ad mentem,* the annulment of a marriage contracted between two pagans before baptism apparently without any intention of forming an indissoluble union. The mind of the Church is, it explains, that if there remains a doubt about the validity of the marriage the decision be in favor of the convert.[2] Another convert abandoned by his wife partly through his fault is authorized to take advantage of the Pauline privilege, provided he has not given her sufficient cause for desertion or he has made due reparation.[3] The decision is also given *ad mentem* and with the same explanation.

In these cases the doubt bore on the validity of a previous marriage or on the fulfillment of conditions required for the Pauline privilege, but not on the baptism of the parties. The Code, in the article which treats of the privilege, lays down the rule again in general terms that in doubt the privilege of the Faith enjoys the favor of the law; it does not specify anything regarding the nature or object of the doubt (Can. 1127).

It may, then, be asked whether this rule includes also doubts concerning baptism. The Church evidently does not mean to justify any measure that may help religion or facilitate conversion without regard to other interests or acquired rights.

When dealing with marriage we have to remember, moreover, that even as a merely natural contract it is indissoluble by

[1] Const. *Probe te,* 15 Dec., 1741, § 27.

[2] 5 July, 1853; 18 May, 1892, *Coll. P. F.,* n. 2184.

[3] 19 April, 1899; 26 April, 1899, n. 2043, 2044.

divine law. Under the Old Covenant God dispensed from strict observance of this law; under the New he allows some exceptions to it. Still what He has joined together no man can put asunder unless by commission from Him.

St. Paul in Christ's name promulgated the Privilege of the Faith which permits the dissolution of marriage in certain circumstances; the Church as God's representative upon earth in all that concerns religion has received authority to dissolve Christian marriages not yet consummated. She possesses also some, not fully determined, powers over merely legitimate marriages. These are divine concessions; they constitute exceptions to a sacred fundamental ordinance and as such should admit of only strict interpretation. As on the other hand they contain a favor some would interpret them liberally but always within the limits set by their Author or His authorized representative.

What is His real will in the matter? Is the Privilege of the Faith intended to benefit doubtfully baptized as well as certainly not baptized persons? Would the Church have power to extend it to such cases if necessary? Does she really do so? And must we understand Canon 1127 in that sense?

In the absence of sufficiently explicit Scriptural teaching we must gather the answer to these questions from the doctrinal declarations of the Church and principally from her actions as interpreted by Roman Congregations or by approved authors. We can best learn the true meaning of the Privilege from its official applications, and the extent of the Church's power from its exercise in the course of ages.

Among the canonists who discuss this problem some argue that the Privilege of the Faith presupposes as a necessary condition a marriage between two infidels and that as long as there remains some probability of the baptism of the parties or of one of them it can not apply for lack of indispensable foundation.[4]

For the sake of clearness, however, it may be well to distinguish doubt which affects both parties from doubt which exists only on one side.

1. Marriage between two doubtfully baptized persons.—A few canonists solving the doubt in favor of the faith would

[4] Vermeersch, *Periodica*, 1 February, 1925, p. 212.

treat these parties as infidels and declare them entitled to the ordinary privilege. As their chief or only positive argument they appeal to the old rule enunciated by Benedict XIV and to the Canon of the Code, both of which give converts the benefit of the doubt without making any distinction. But, as intimated before, the old rule is too general and indefinite not to need interpretation and admit of, or even call for, some qualification. The words of the Code taken in themselves are perhaps still less conclusive; for, whilst they claim for the Privilege of the Faith the favor of law, they apparently suppose verified the essential condition for the Privilege which may imply a marriage between two certainly non-baptized parties.

The majority of commentators, therefore, reject this first opinion as without solid foundation and as involving serious doctrinal difficulties, as lacking in traditional support and contrary to Roman practice.[5]

As the baptism of both parties in the case is subjectively doubtful, they argue, it may happen to be objectively real and valid. We have then a Christian marriage which certainly does not come under St. Paul's ruling and which after consummation the Church has no authority to dissolve. If, therefore, in such cases she should declare the parties free by application of the Privilege of the Faith, she would run the risk of pronouncing against the divine law and of sanctioning a union formed whilst the previous one still holds, an intention which we can hardly suppose in the Church, who is ever so careful in all that pertains to the marriage bond, deciding against it only on strictly conclusive evidence and dispensing from no other than purely ecclesiastical impediments.

This reasoning possesses real, yet not fully convincing, force. Canonists experience no little difficulty in accounting on dogmatic grounds for some of the dispensations granted in favor of the faith from interpellations. Still they do not question their legitimacy.[6] Again, under the former discipline Roman Congregations as a general rule treated doubtful baptism in relation to marriage as certain until proved otherwise. This too might lead to conclusions not easy to justify doctrinally;

[5] G. Arendt, S.J., *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses,* April, 1924, p. 181; A. Vermeersch, S.J., l.c.; J. Creusen, S.J., *Nouvelle Revue Théologique,* April, 1925; Cappello, *De Matrimonio,* n. 788.

[6] Wernz, *De Matrimonio,* n. 702, note 66.

for example, to the dissolution in the external forum of a marriage valid before God or to the granting of permission for a new marriage, in spite of the bond of a former one.[7] To escape some of these difficulties certain canonists gave to the presumption in favor of baptism the value of one *juris et de jure,* but they seemed to have little positive foundation for their explanation, which was commonly rejected.[8]

Moreover, by the law which favors the faith we may possibly understand the divine, as well as the ecclesiastical, law, as if God Himself and not simply the Church extended the Pauline Privilege to the cases of doubtful baptism.[9]

We may not, then, deny the existence of a privilege because we do not see the reason for it or do not understand its possibility, but we have the right to demand serious, positive proofs for it. Now, and this is the chief argument against this opinion, neither Scripture nor Tradition contains specific evidence for the extension of the Privilege of the Faith to marriages between doubtfully baptized persons. The defenders of the theory under discussion do not quote any authentic declaration or official decision that clearly confirms it. We find the constant rule spoken of by Benedict XIV not infrequently used for the solution of various kinds of doubts even in relation to marriage, but apparently not when the doubt affected the baptism of the parties. Occasions for applying it to such cases must have presented themselves in the past, even though perhaps not as often as at present. When they occurred, canonists solved the problem on the principle that doubtful baptism has the same effect on marriage as certainly valid baptism; they did not make an exception in favor of the faith. It would seem strange that a privilege, if it exists, should remain unknown or unused to its full extent, for so many centuries.

In reality we have a few examples of petitions presented to the Holy See for its application. In 1872 the Vicar Apostolic of Central Oceania submitted to the Holy Office the case of a marriage between two doubtfully baptized heretics; one of them, having entered the Church and received baptism again, was shortly after abandoned by the other party, and as he

[7] Wernz, l.c., n. 508, note 30-33; Gasparri *De Matrimonio,* n. 599, 602, 603.
[8] Gasparri, n. 599; Santi-Leitner, *Praelectiones Juris Canonici,* L. iv, n. 171.
[9] *Periodica de re Canonica et Morali,* 1 March, 1922, (26).

asked whether by reason of the very serious doubt which existed regarding his baptism in heresy he might not take advantage of the Pauline Privilege, the Congregation answered in the negative.[10]

A Roman canonist assures us that to the present day the Holy Office maintains the same attitude;[11] and recently a Review has made known one of its decisions declaring in a similar case that there was no ground for application of the Pauline Privilege.[12] Dr. A. C. M. Schaepman, a strong defender of the opposite view, who publishes this decree, adds that as an answer of a Congregation to a particular request it does not definitely settle the question. And perhaps theoretically it does not, but practically it does, at least for the present, pending an authentic doctrinal declaration. It would be imprudent, to say the least, for any one to grant what the Holy Office feels compelled to refuse.

2. Marriage between a certainly unbaptized, and a doubtfully baptized, person.—This case differs in some important respects from the preceding one.

Application of the Pauline Privilege would not present here the doctrinal difficulties mentioned above. If the baptism which seems doubtful happened to be objectively valid, as long as one of the contracting parties is certainly not baptized the marriage remains a merely legitimate one which the Church has authority to dissolve. Neither do the decrees of the Holy Office just referred to directly affect this case. Hence several canonists who would not apply the Privilege when there exists a serious probability that the two parties in a marriage contract had received valid baptism, do not hesitate to do so when the probability exists only on one side.[13]

Because of their authority this opinion may have at least extrinsic probability. On close consideration, however, its intrinsic probability does not appear so clearly from the evidence at hand.

The differences between the two cases, although real, may not justify the distinction made between them. Of the two

[10] *Coll. P. F.*, vol. 2, p. 59, n. 1392.

[11] *Periodica*, 1 February, 1925, p. (213).

[12] *Nederlandsche Katholieke Stemmen*, 1925, p. 57.

[13] Cappello, *De Matrimonio*, n. 788; Creusen, *Epitome*, II, n. 434; *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, Av. 1925, p. 230, 234; Vermeersch, *Periodica*, 1 Feb., 1925, p. (212), 1 March, 1922, p. (27).

principal ones just pointed out, the second is merely negative; the first would at most prove the possibility of extending the privilege to marriages between certainly not baptized and doubtfully baptized persons, not the fact of its extension. For the fact itself there is the same apparent lack of positive, known evidence, the same absence of support from pontifical decisions in this case as in the preceding one.

Under the former discipline, it is true, the impediment of disparity of cult rendered these marriages invalid, leaving no occasion for application of the Privilege of the Faith, but the impediment acquired universal annulling force only after the seventh, perhaps not before the twelfth, century, allowing time for the development of jurisprudence.[14]

Here the principle should hold also that the favor granted by law to the privilege presupposes the certain existence of the fundamental condition required by St. Paul, viz. a marriage between infidels.[15]

The Church can extend the favor to cases not perhaps covered by St. Paul's concession, but this implies exercise of a rather extraordinary power which we should not presume without fairly clear, positive proofs. As already remarked, we do not find these proofs in decisions of the Holy See. In the decree of 1872 quoted above we might rather find an indication to the contrary. The Holy Office answers negatively, without any distinction, the question whether a convert from heresy whose baptism is very doubtful may enjoy the same privilege as a convert from infidelity.

If Canon 1127 does not apply to marriages between two doubtfully baptized persons it may not apply to marriages between unbaptized and doubtfully baptized ones. The main reason for refusing extension of the privilege in the first case does not exist in the second, but there may be others. The dissolution of a marriage is always a serious and delicate matter; the handling of a "razor" which may cut so many marital knots should require much caution and skill; the Holy See might not wish to place it in every hand indiscriminately.

Facilitating the dissolution of marriage and rendering it more frequent would not increase respect for the marriage bond

[14] Wernz, l.c., n. 504.

[15] Vermeersch, *Periodica*, 1 Feb., 1925, p. 212.

or confidence in the Church as practically the sole defender of the indissolubity of the marriage contract.

When these cases occur, therefore, it would seem at least more prudent to refer them to the Holy See till we have an official declaration or a well established jurisprudence.

3. Certainly a light or merely negative doubt could not justify application of the Pauline Privilege.—On account of the great importance of Baptism the custom has prevailed in the reception of converts to renew the sacrament conditionally whenever there remains any doubt, even though not very serious, about its previous administration or validity. In some countries this means in almost every case, although the Holy See has repeatedly prescribed investigation of every individual case. But to break a union in itself indissoluble and deprive the other party of certainly acquired rights must demand at least a serious, positive doubt.

It may frequently exist in regard to baptisms administered by non-Catholics, for want of proper matter, form or intention.

In baptisms by aspersion there is generally danger that the water did not flow if it fell on the person at all.[16] Still the Church recognizes the validity of baptism by aspersion and we may not question the validity of a sacrament thus administered without some proof.

Changes or omissions in the form may vitiate it, but every alteration does not have that effect. Text books of Theology and the old *Corpus Juris* give examples of very much disfigured forms which the Church accepted as strictly sufficient to secure the validity of the sacrament.

As to the intention, the Church has defined that sanctity is not required in the minister for the validity of baptism, nor even faith. Whatever may be his personal opinions and those of his church about the effects of baptism, if he intends to perform the rite established by Christ or traditionally used by the Christian Church, that is sufficient. The Vicar Apostolic of Central Oceania in the petition already referred to represented to the Holy Office that some heretical ministers before baptizing their converts warned them that the rite had no effect on the soul and was merely an external sign of their affiliation with the sect; he asked, therefore, whether under those conditions bap-

[16] Lehmkuhl, *Theologia Moralis,* vol. ii, n. 61, 62.

tism should not be considered as invalid for want of sufficient intention on the part of the minister. The Holy Office answered in the negative.[17]

H. A. AYRINHAC, S.S.

Menlo Park, California.

DID CHRIST EAT THE PASCH?

It was with great interest but considerable surprise that I read the account in the April number of the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, written by "Sacerdos Nicodemus," concerning the time of our Lord's Last Passover and Crucifixion. With surprise, I say, because the writer seems to cut the Gordian knot of the problem with such facility. This disputed question is not solved by any means according to the methods he proposes. To my mind the case seems to be a despairing one. It is very doubtful whether a satisfactory solution, one that will remove all difficulties, can ever be forthcoming. The writer begins by telling us that the Eastern and the Western Church were entirely of one accord on this point, a statement which is not quite correct. Though the view that Christ died on the 14th Nisan was rather widespread in the early centuries, nevertheless the fact that Apollinarius undertook to refute those who held the 14th as the date of the Last Supper and the 15th as the date of the Crucifixion, shows that the Quartodecimans were not in absolute possession of the field.

Moreover, the other question, whether our Lord ate the Pasch the same day as the Jews, was very much disputed. Eusebius of Cæsarea writes: "Our Lord ate the Pasch, as the Scripture testifies, on the 1st day of the Azymes; the Jews, however, not on the usual day, but on the following day, which was the 2nd of the Azymes, and the 15th of the moon." St. John Chrysostom is of the same opinion, for he says: "Christ observed the time of eating the Pasch; but the Jews did not hesitate to violate many laws." According to St. Epiphanius: "Christ ate the Pasch with some of the Jews, on Thursday, the 14th; the rest of the Jews, together with the Pharisees, ate the Pasch on Friday."

[17] 18 December, 1872; *Coll. P. F.*, l.c., p. 60.

Again, the Quartodecimans of Laodicea admitted that our Lord died on the 14th Nisan, but at the same time they denied that He ate the Pasch.

Most of the Greek Fathers declare that our Lord ate the Pasch on the 13th by anticipation. The majority of the Latin Fathers agree that Christ ate the Pasch on the 14th, as the Law prescribed. It is therefore incorrect to say that there was perfect agreement in the Eastern Controversy on this point. That our Lord died on the 14th before sunset we may say was the general opinion of the Fathers of the first two centuries; but whether our Lord ate the Pasch that year or anticipated it was seriously enough disputed.

As to the question, at what hour of the 14th day of Nisan the Paschal Lamb was eaten, Sacerdos Nicodemus seems to me to give an answer that is evidently contrary to the Mosaic regulation on this point. He says: ". . . the Jewish Paschal Lamb was eaten at the moment of sunset when the new or fourteenth day began. If this were not the case, the fourteenth day would mean nothing; the fourteenth would be the fifteenth, and this again the sixteenth, and so on."

Strange as this may be, the legal time for observing the Passover was after sunset on the 14th. Certainly the Jewish day commenced at sunset. The time to kill and prepare the Paschal Lamb is pointed out with sufficient clearness in the Book of Exodus where it is stated that: "You shall keep it until the fourteenth day of this month: and the whole multitude of the children of Israel shall sacrifice it in the evening."[1] Now the evening of the fourteenth would not be sunset of the thirteenth, for that time would be but the beginning of the fourteenth, according to Jewish computations.

Further on in the same chapter the Jews are instructed how to observe this feast of the Pasch in the following words: "The first month the fourteenth day of the month in the evening you shall eat unleavened bread until the one-and-twentieth day of the same month in the evening. Seven days there shall not be found any leaven in your houses."[2]

If we start counting from sunset on the 14th, i. e. the close of the 14th until the sunset of the 21st, we have the required

[1] Exod. 12:6.
[2] Exod. 12:18-19.

number of days; whereas, if we commence counting from sunset of the 13th we should have not seven but eight days. It is evident that the beginning of the 14th is not the time intended. I do not believe that any of the Fathers of the Church or exegetical scholars have ever understood the time of the 14th in this sense. The fact that Josephus[3] sometimes mentions eight days of unleavened bread is due to the fact that he occasionally included from mid-day of the 14th until sunset as one day, which would then make eight days. Both Josephus and the Tract. Jom. tob. ch. V state that the Jews began to remove all leaven from their houses about noon of the 14th. The time then to eat the Pasch was at the close of the 14th day, or, to be precise, after sunset, when darkness was beginning to set in. Concerning this we read: "And they shall all eat the flesh that night roasted at the fire."[4] According to Rabbinical tradition the Paschal Lamb could be eaten any time up to midnight of the 15th Nisan. The Paschal Lamb had to be killed and prepared before sunset. The Vulgate mentions the time by the phrase "ad vesperam". The Douai Version translates this phrase by the words: "in the evening." Both expressions are somewhat vague.

The Hebrew version is more definite as to the time; for it says that the lamb was to be killed "inter duas vesperas". The Jews divided the close of the day into two evenings. The first evening began when the sun was about midway in its decline toward the horizon; and this evening lasted until sunset. According to our computation of time, this evening commenced about 3 o'clock and lasted until dusk. The second evening was from sunset until dusk.

The phrase, then, "inter duas vesperas," meant at that time of the year, the period of time between 3 o'clock in the afternoon and about 6 in the evening. During this time the paschal lamb was to be killed and prepared. Any time after sunset the Jews could begin to eat it. The problem therefore remains. Certainly the Gospel narrative is inspired. How then are we to explain, with at least some degree of reasonableness, the apparent contradiction between the synoptic writers and St. John? According to the account given by St. John, it would seem that

[3] Antiq. 2, 15, 1; 3, 10, 5.
[4] Exod. 12:8.

the Jews had not yet eaten the Pasch when our Lord was brought to Pilate. Therefore the Friday of that year was not, as the Synoptic writers state, the 15th Nisan, the day of the solemnity, but the day was still the 14th Nisan.

The easier method, in any attempt to solve the problem, is to follow the account given by the three synoptic evangelists, and endeavor to show how the account given by St. John does not really differ from theirs; for to attempt to prove that the synoptic evangelists are in agreement with St. John on this point is beset with more serious difficulties. The synoptic account of the Last Supper is, moreover, clearer, more according to the Jewish custom, and the theory generally accepted in the Catholic Church: as the use of the unleavened bread naturally suggests.

The three synoptic evangelists declare that our Lord ate the Pasch on the evening of the 14th and that He died the following day, which would therefore be the feast day itself, the Solemn Day of the Pasch.[5]

There are three principal objections against this opinion. The first is that St. John seems to say that the Last Supper took place on the day before the legal time, for he writes: "Before the festival day of the Pasch."[6] Now, nowhere do we find that the actual eating of the lamb, the "phase" or "transitus Domini", is described as the "festival day", whereas the term "Pasch" applies to the whole octave, but especially to the "Solemn Day", the 15th Nisan. Thus in the Book of Numbers we read: "And in the first month, on the 14th day of the month, shall be the phase of the Lord. And on the 15th day, the Solemn Feast."[7]

On three different occasions St. John mentions the festival day in connexion with the Pasch. It is clear that he refers to the "Solemn Day", when there was a vast concourse of people in the Temple."[8]

The phrase, then, "before the festival day", refers to the day on which the paschal lamb was eaten, which according to the Synoptics was the 14th Nisan.

[5] Cf. St. Matt. 26:17ff; St. Mark 14:1-2; St. Luke 22:7.
[6] St. John 13:1.
[7] Numbers 28:16-17.
[8] Cf. St. John 11:56; 12:20; 13:29.

Again it is argued that, when the Jews brought Jesus to Pilate, they refused to enter the governor's hall, lest they should incur a legal defilement and thus be prevented from eating the Pasch.[9] Comparing St. Luke's account of the time with that given by St. John, we gather that our Lord must have been brought before the Sanhedrim at least soon after daybreak and before sunrise. After this mock trial they took Him to the governor's hall and it woud seem that Pilate heard the case before the usual time, which according to Roman custom was about three hours after sunrise, or 9 o'clock in the morning. Now legal defilement expired with sundown, as is evident from Levit. 16: 1-18. But what did the Jews mean by: "ut manducarent Pascha—that they might eat the Pasch?" Here is the main difficulty. There were sacrifices to be offered on each of the seven days. These sacrifices are mentioned in various places of the Pentateuch.[10] The phrase "to eat the Pasch", refers in this place to the Peace Offerings that were sacrificed on the "Solemn Day", and on the following days. These sacrifices were known by the name "Chaghigah—festive sacrifices".[11] These sacrifices were offered up at noon on each of the seven days. The celebrated Knabenbauer, though admitting that the word "Pasch" could refer to the celebrations of the whole octave, says that the expression "to eat the Pasch" could mean nothing else but "to eat the Paschal Lamb". But why should this necessarily be so? After all, we must observe that the Evangelists did not always use their terms with absolute precision. Moreover, St. John is not quoting the exact words of the Jews. They might have used the exact term "Chaghigah", which St. John calls "eating the Pasch", because these sacrifices were partaken of on each of the seven days. It cannot be said with absolute certainty that the phrase "to eat the Pasch", was restricted solely to the ceremonial of the Paschal Lamb of the 14th Nisan. The words "Pesach", "Pascha" and "Phase" have the same meaning and refer to the ceremony of the Paschal Lamb. "Pesach", the old Hebrew word, was changed to "Pascha" after the Babylonian captivity, due to the Chaldaic influence upon the language.

[9] St. John 18:28.

[10] Exod. 12: 16; Lev. 32: 7; 2 Paral. 35: 7-14; Num. 28: 18-22.

[11] Cf. Deut. 16: 2-3; 2 Paral. 35: 7-9.

"Phase" is the Greek rendition of the Hebrew word. St. Jerome assures us that the ancient Hebrews always pronounced the "pe" soft, i. e., as "phe". The guttural "ch", being difficult for Greeks and Latins to pronounce, was suppressed, and "e" was inserted in its place.

Thus "Pascha" became "Phase". Cornelius à Lapide gives various examples of this change in Hebrew words. But the word "phase" is not always used to denote only the celebration of the Paschal Lamb. Sometimes it refers to this celebration, as in the passage from Deuteronomy, which reads as follows: "Thou mayst not immolate the phase in any one of thy cities, which the Lord thy God will give thee. . . . And thou shalt dress and eat it in the place which the Lord thy God shall choose."[12] But in the same chapter of Deuteronomy just quoted, the word is used in a different sense: "Thou shalt sacrifice the phase to the Lord thy God of sheep and oxen."

Here the mention of oxen shows that the term "phase", as used here, refers to the sacrifices to be offered on the various days of the octave: which sacrifices were known by the name "Chaghigah". Knabenbauer,[13] in a footnote, refers to various Rabbinical authors who declare that sheep were for the "Pasch" and oxen for the "Chaghigah". The admission of this does not militate against our view. The point to notice is that the word "phase", as there used, applies in a general sense to all the sacrifices of the octave, including also the ceremony of the Paschal Lamb. Why then is it not possible and even probable that the word "Pasch" was used by the Jews in the same sense and that St. John also used the term in this extended sense? Another serious objection urged against the synoptic account is that St. John says that the day on which our Lord died was the parasceve of the Pasch and the following day a great Sabbath day. St. Mark explains this point clearly; for he says, "because it was the Parasceve, the day before the Sabbath".[14]

Commenting on this point, Fr. Pope, O.P., says: "Those who hold this view (i. e., that the Parasceve was that of the Pasch), must prove that there was a day of 'Preparation' for

[12] Deut. 16:5-7; cf. also Ex. 12:5-14.

[13] Com. in Matth.

[14] St. Mark 15:42.

any Feast, also that any Feast was termed a 'Sabbath'. But neither of these points can be proved."

St. John calls the day the Parasceve of the Pasch simply because the "Solemn Day" of the Pasch was also the Parasceve. The following day was called a great Sabbath because it was made the basis for offering up the sheaf of first fruits of the corn-harvest.[15] The final objection that all kinds of labor were forbidden on the festival days, as well as criminal proceedings, is not true. The Sabbath rest was rigorously interpreted; not so strict was the rest required on feast days.

Sometimes criminals were put to death on the festival days, in order to inspire the people with a salutary fear. In conclusion, then, we may say that it is more probable that our Lord ate the Pasch along with the Jews at the prescribed time, the evening of the 14th Nisan, which was Thursday and that He died on the "Solemn Day" of the Azymes, before sunset. He thus became our true Paschal Lamb, and with St. Paul and the Church in the office of the Resurrection we can say: "Pascha nostrum immolatus est Christus."

MONACHUS BENEDICTINUS.

THE CHURCH AND NON-CATHOLIC MARRIAGES.

Qu. On page 302 of the March number of the REVIEW you say that Canon 1070 "declares valid all non-Catholic marriages". And further on you say again that a certain "marriage is valid . . . as its validity has no reference to baptism". It seems to me that the Code will not permit of such interpretation, for it says of these marriages: "standum est pro valore, *donec*", etc. Dr. Ayrinhac translates the text as follows: "The marriage is to be held *as valid until* it is proved with certainty" that it is not. Which obviously means, in my judgment, that the Church does not intend to take official cognizance of non-Catholic marriages until such time as they come or are brought before her courts officially for determination as to their status, that is, their Catholic status. When in the course of human events, for one cause or another, non-Catholics present themselves to the jurisdiction of the Church to ascertain the status of their marriage with relation to the Church, then and then only does the Church pronounce as to validity, or dissolubility "in favorem fidei". Therefore it seems to me to be wrong to say, and the Code does not say it, that the validity of these marriages has no reference

[15] Lev. 23.

to baptism. On the contrary, the Code says very definitely that "the marriages (of non-Catholics, as well as Catholics) must stand as valid until it is proved (officially) with certainty that one party was baptized and the other was not".

Resp. The first section of Canon 1070 declares invalid a marriage contracted between an unbaptized person and a person baptized in the Catholic Church, or one converted thereto from heresy or schism. It therefore exempts from this "lex irritans" all baptized Protestants who have not been converted, whenever they contract marriage among themselves, and hence, at least negatively, it "declares valid all non-Catholic marriages", with regard to this impediment. The impediment is restricted in its extension; formerly it rendered invalid marriage between any unbaptized person and any baptized person: it now invalidates marriage only between an unbaptized person and a person baptized in the Catholic Church.

Since the first section of the canon has exempted non-Catholics from subjection to this impediment, the second section refers only to marriages already contracted in which at least one of the parties has been baptized in the Catholic Church or has been converted from heresy or schism. The various cases are presented in Wernz-Vidal (269):

"1. If two Catholics contract marriage, and later a serious doubt arises concerning the baptism of one or both parties which cannot be removed by investigation, conditional baptism should be administered, but without prejudice to the validity of the marriage, i. e. the marriage is presumed to be valid; objectively it will be invalid, if, *de facto,* one party was baptized and the other unbaptized; and if this should be proved, it must be declared invalid.

"2. If a Catholic, certainly baptized, contracted marriage with a heretic doubtfully baptized, or (a Catholic) doubtfully baptized with a heretic doubtfully baptized, or invalidly baptized, in the three cases the marriage must be considered valid, but it will be declared invalid if it should be proved that one was baptized, the other unbaptized.

"3. What has been said of a Catholic, applies also to a non-Catholic, who at any time belonged to the Catholic Church, and became subject to the impediment of disparity of worship according to Canon 1070 § 1.

"4. If heretics who have never belonged to the Catholic Church contract marriage among themselves, their marriages are always valid on this head, whether the baptism of one or both parties is valid or doubtful or invalid, since they are not bound in the impediment of disparity of worship."

The rather strong statements in the query lack foundation, as they assume Canon 1070 § 2 includes marriages between non-Catholics, who, however, have already been exempted from this impediment in the first section of the canon.

MASS STIPEND FROM PERSONS IN DEBT.

Qu. I have met a difficulty (at least it seems one to me), and would be greatly relieved if you could give a solution to it. It is thus:

John, a Catholic who is extremely ill and conscious that death is near, gives the parish priest fifty dollars with instructions to say ten Masses, the remainder (forty dollars) to be applied to his funeral expenses.

The parish priest learns, before he says the Masses, that John has considerable debts outside the assumed funeral expenses. These debts were known to the sick man. Can the priest retain the stipend and say the Masses, or has he to apply it toward the patient's debts, ignoring the request for the Masses?

Resp. When a person in debt foresees that he will probably not secure sufficient means to meet his obligations, any donation he may make is valid, but he is guilty of injustice to his creditors. A person who, knowing this situation, induces a debtor to make a donation to him, participates in the injustice, and is bound to restitution. If he uses no persuasion, but, knowing the debtor's disability, accepts a gift from him, there is a probable opinion that he may retain it (Lessius 2, 20, 168), since in this case he is not the "causa efficax damni," and merely exercises his right; and neither justice nor charity demands that he forego his own advantage, although *per accidens* it causes loss to another. Finally, if a person accepts a gift in ignorance of the donor's inability to meet his obligations, he is not bound to restitution, as, in good faith, he receives what is validly given.

What is true of a simple donation, is still more true of stipends for Masses. The priest may safely retain the stipends

and say the Masses; indeed he should do so, as this may be regarded furthermore as a legitimate expenditure, in accordance with John's state in life.

THE CONCLUSION OF THE "VENI CREATOR."

Our liturgical censor takes exception to the statement in the June issue of the REVIEW regarding the conclusion of the "Veni Creator Spiritus" outside Paschaltide. It is true that there is a decision of the S. C. of Rites to the effect of the change as mentioned (7 April and 28 July, 1867) in the *Decreta Authentica* of that date. Not only is this decision omitted from the later edition of the *Decreta,* but the S. Congregation decided in 1899 (20 June) that there is to be no change in the Pentecostal form of the hymn at any time of the year:

> Doxologiam: *Deo Patri sit gloria*
> *Et Filio qui a mortuis*
> *Surrexit ac Paraclito*
> *In saeculorum saecula*
>
> ita esse consendam praefati hymni propriam, ut eadem semper sit retinenda ac nunquam quovis anni tempore vel quocumque occurrente festo in aliam mutandam.

RULES FOR THE BOOK-BUYER.

1. Do not buy a book simply because it appeals to you by its captious title, or because of the praise of it contained in the book-trader's announcement, or of the name of the notary who writes the introduction or a commendatory letter. These are tokens often independent of the merit or value of a book.

2. Let not the price of a book be the determining factor in your purchase. A book worth having is worth ten books that are merely cheap.

3. Buy books only which serve you for study or repeated reading. Casual reading can be done by borrowing books.

4. Before buying valuable books consult a friend who knows you. Excellent books are often useless to a reader not prepared to assimilate their value.

5. Be slow in accumulating a library for your personal use. Examine a book before making it your own.

6. Do not buy on general recommendations. Be sure you want a book before purchasing it.

7. Serial works offered on subscription plan are most often mere business enterprises. They have of course a useful aim. Wait until you see the whole work; then consult your own need, utility, and purse.

FUNERALS OF CHILDREN.

Qu. What is the general rule to be observed in the burial of infants who were not solemnly baptized but who died almost immediately after birth, the Catholic nurse having made some attempt to supply private baptism? Are such children entitled to burial in consecrated ground? What Mass is to be said, if any, in such case?

Resp. The child is entitled to Christian burial. The Mass is either a votive Mass "In Gratiarum Actione" or "De Angelis" or the Mass of the feast or ferial. It does not, however, enjoy the privileges of the Requiem Mass *in die obitus* as regards the rubrical prescriptions. We may here repeat for general guidance what has been said on the subject in the REVIEW (Vol. XXIII, 1900, August, p. 187).

In the burial of children a distinction is made between:

1. unbaptized children;

2. baptized children who die before the use of reason (including the insane);

3. baptized children who die after attaining the use of reason.

Unbaptized children are ordinarily buried in a place set apart for the purpose, not consecrated.

But if born of Catholic parents they may be buried with the latter in consecrated ground.

In case of doubtfully valid baptism the child is buried in consecrated ground.

Children who have attained the use of reason are buried with adult rite.

Baptized children who die before reaching the age of reason are buried with the rites of joy at the call of the innocent, the vestments being white, and the cross without the staff carried by the altar server, as a symbol of the short life having attained salvation through the passion of Christ.

In case baptism has been administered privately, even if there be doubt about its validity, the doubt is answered in favor of the child through the abounding mercy of God.

Ecclesiastical Library Table

RECENT BIBLE STUDY.

The Old Testament.

Dr. Moffatt's "new translation" of the Old Testament is now completed by the appearance of its second volume.[1] The latter is the literary mate of its predecessor—usually apt to a nicety in conveying the sense of the Hebrew idiom, but governed in its choice of synonyms by two outstanding rules: that the natural is always to be preferred to the supernatural, and the crude usually to the elegant. The Semitic mind is well portrayed through the forms of its everyday concepts, so long as these concepts can be presented, not as the medium through which truths of the most exalted character have sought expression, but merely as in themselves the sum and substance of the whole. And so the greatest religious literature of antiquity (supposing it were nothing more) has in our progressive times been rendered into English often calculated to obscure even the native dignity of the original, and the finished product delivered to our enlightened public as the final word of scholarship. As to the exegetical features of the work, they are, in the second volume as in the first, controlled by a single tendency: to obliterate every testimony of sacred Hebrew literature to anything approaching a supra-human origin, nature or mission of the expected Christ. A very few instances will suffice to illustrate this principle. (1) Isaias 7: 14, the Hebrew of which reads: "Behold the Virgin pregnant and bearing a son and calling his name Immanuel"—binding a triple participial predicate as closely as possible in a single time-relation with its subject—is blandly rendered: "There *is* a young woman with child, who *shall* bear a son and call his name 'Immanuel'."[2] (2) In Isaias 9: 6 the name of the "Child born to us", in the Hebrew text "Wonder-counsellor, God the Mighty, Father for ever, Prince of Peace", is rendered: "A wonder of a counsellor, *a divine hero,* a father for all time, a peaceful prince." No wonder that Dr. Moffatt afterward

[1] *The Old Testament.* A New Translation, by James Moffatt, D.D., D.Litt., M.A., (Oxon.). Volume II: Job-Malachi. New York: George H. Doran Co.

[2] Italics inserted throughout these citations.

omits the entire context of Chapter 10:21, which uses the same phrase "God the Mighty" within this same cycle of oracles, in a sense that could not be disputed, even were there any analogy for "divine hero" in the preceding chapter. So evident, in fact, is the meaning of this phrase as mere Hebrew diction, that even the modern Jewish version of the Old Testament (marginally) [3] tries to transfer it from the Child so named to the Giver of the name, rather than pretend that it may have another meaning than "God the Mighty". The Hebrew scholarship of the authors of this version is beyond question. (3) The sublime description of the Suffering Servant of Yahweh (52:13-53) is "interpreted" indeed, for 52:13 is made to read: "Behold, my servant *Israel* yet shall rise", and 53:2, "Why, *Israel* of old grew like a sapling"; thus fixing the identity of the Servant to the translator's liking, but without a vestige of objective evidence to justify his interpolation of the text. It would be interesting to know what is meant by "Israel's" death and burial; how any Old Testament prophet could avow his people unspotted in the sight of God and suffering only for the sins of other peoples; how, even in this impossible event, "Israel's" sufferings and death could be termed, in patently sacrificial language, a means of expiation and effectual intercession. This, however, by the way; for the outright insertion of the name "Israel" on the translator's sheer initiative is a blemish to his credit more than grave enough to forfeit his right to positive refutation. (4) Even the noun *mashiach,* always literally "anointed one", in all of its nine occurrences in the Psalms is paraphrased by "own" or "chosen", and thus divested of a well-defined force familiar to even the ancient Hebrews. Not with more avidity did Tyndale banish from his New Testament the current Christian words "priest", "church", "chalice" and "penance" than Dr. Moffatt has labored to efface from the Old Testament the figure of Christ Himself.

Enough of this "new translation". But for its author's name, it could not have merited a serious line. It is true, of course, that both his arbitrary renderings and the tendency they reveal are familiar enough to students of modern skeptical Protestantism, and that many a popular preacher of its natural-

[3] The text leaves the Hebrew untranslated.

istic and pagan cult will welcome this production as the Lutheran agitators of England welcomed those of Tyndale, Coverdale, and Matthew. Nevertheless, one cannot dismiss the hope that the placing of a private and prejudiced Bible in the hands of the uninstructed public as the acknowledged standard of the age, and that without even the marginal suggestion of a single alternative, will not find unqualified favor with the nobler element among even radical exegetes. For there is that about it which casts an unmerited shadow over the name of impartial scholarship, and he who refrains from protesting in that name must bear his share of blame for its dishonor.

* * *

Two other works of real value on the Old Testament have also just attained completion. One is Dr. Schumacher's *Handbook,*[4] of which Volume II now follows I and III. The other is Dr. Boylan's second and final volume on the Psalms.[5]

In the former of these we have an outline of Special Introduction to the Old Testament which, in the main, is well up to the author's superior standard. In common with the two preceding volumes, this one adopts a system of marginal indentation that involves much waste of space in a relatively expensive book; while as to contents, it pretends to little beyond the brevity of an outline. But these limitations are familiar to present users of the *Handbook,* and do not seriously impair its value.

The present volume, again in union with its companions, does not merely outline both sides of the principal controversies within its scope, but clearly and temperately indicates their true solution. This is well exemplified by passages such as those dealing with Pentateuchal criticism, the value of the Psalm titles and the authorship of Isaias. In the material they furnish, two features of the volume are especially helpful. One is the clear and comprehensive survey of the tangled problems of text, history and authorship presented by such Books as those of Daniel, Tobias and Judith. The other consists in the extensive lists of "special problems" pertaining to the several

[4] *A Handbook of Scripture Study.* By the Rev. H. Schumacher, D.D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis in the Catholic University of America. Vol. II: The Old Testament. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1925.

[5] *The Psalms.* A Study of the Vulgate Psalter in the Light of the Hebrew Text. By Rev. Patrick Boylan, M.A., D.Litt., D.D., Professor of Sacred Scripture and Oriental Languages, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, etc. Volume Two: Psalms LXXII-CL. St. Louis: Herder; Dublin: M. H. Gill.

Books and concluding the separate treatment of each. These surveys should prove of the greatest value to lecturers and teachers as a convenient guide to completeness of treatment. The mere enumeration of these special questions reveals the range of the author's research.

There are, of course, some minor inaccuracies and some slight matters of questionable certainty. In the citation of Wiener's works (p. 3) the spelling "Pentateuchical" might be a typographical error if it occurred only once. The same portions of Esdras are "Chaldaic" on pp. 80-81 and "Aramaic" on p. 85. The date 745 assigned (p. 175) to Tigleth-Pileser III's invasion of Galilee is probably at least ten years too early, and seems to conflict implicitly with notices on pp. 63-64 and 67. That "the assumption of a schematic chronology" of the Kings on Fr. Kleber's part "is gratuitous" (p. 71), is doubtless Kugler's assertion, but that it is correct, and therefore a "decisive reason" for rejecting Fr. Kleber's system, we cannot admit with the latter's own arguments before us. Finally, does the "periodistic or harmonistic theory" of the Hexaëmeron deserve to be classed (p. 30) as "idealistic" merely because prolonged periods occurring in succession are alleged in accordance with a recognized metaphor? It seems to us that Dr. Hoberg's conspectus of this subject displays an apter analysis.

There are, in fact, several disappointing features of Dr. Schumacher's section on Genesis, even allowing for the immensity of the subject and of its literature. Hetzenauer's commentary is of the very foremost value from every point of view, and should certainly have been mentioned among works of reference. Among the "special problems" relating to Genesis, the question of its bearing on evolution, whether irrational or human, is not even named. The treatment of the Hexaëmeron is scarcely satisfactory. The only "literature" mentioned is a single work of Zapletal. The periodistic theory (for which, by the way, we hold no brief) has been recently defended by no less an authority than Cardinal Billot, whose article in *Gregorianum* Vol. IV (1923), pp. 1-16, is worth perusal. But even if Zapletal has the final word to date, what is that word? We are informed (p. 30) that "as a solution Zapletal offers the 'natural explanation' of the text"; but we cannot say that the

central problem—what is meant by "six days" successively enumerated—is explained at all, either in Zapletal's words or in Dr. Schumacher's. The arrangement of the creative works in a schematic rather than a successive order is apparently involved, but all else is negation; and this one positive feature alone would make Zapletal's theory more "idealistic" than some of those which he rejects.

This paucity of authorities cited is a rather predominant feature of "special problems" throughout the volume. One would not, of course, expect a dozen or so for every question, but it is rather surprising to find that the favorite number is one. At times, too, that one is not wholly a fortunate choice. For example, the student who should betake himself to Thirtle for information on the Titles of the Psalms (p. 141), would be rather regaled with a fantastic theory than supplied with the substantial information of the subject.

These entirely minor imperfections, however, should in no way diminish the welcome due to Dr. Schumacher's valuable *Handbook* on the part of clergy and laity alike. In all substantial respects, a sounder and more complete conspectus of its vast subject could not reasonably be demanded; and no student of Holy Scripture will add these three volumes to his library without knowing himself their author's debtor in no slight amount.

Dr. Boylan's second volume on the Psalms will need no further introduction than its announcement as a fitting companion to his first. He sustains to the last page the scholarly and yet interesting and suggestive treatment which was his standard from the beginning. The very marrow of the work, the parallel versions of the text, accomplishes a most difficult task. Every student of the Old Testament knows that divergencies between the Vulgate and the current Hebrew text are nowhere more difficult to reconcile than in the Psalter. Dr. Boylan, with a thorough mastery of the Hebrew, has set beside the Vulgate version in his pages an English metrical rendering of the Hebrew which accommodates itself to the Vulgate to a surprising extent, and incidentally suggests to the technical student some possibilities of textual reconstruction. This alone is an achievement of note. In his commentary the author explains matters

clearly without prolixity, and his prefaced surveys of the argument and structure of each Psalm are almost in themselves a sufficient exposition of its meaning.

In a brief excursus the various explanations of the phrase *Canticum Graduum* are well stated and criticized. Possibly too much importance is attached to Friedrich Delitzch's insistence on the "caravan" application. As a matter of fact, whatever of solid foundation there is in this interpretation of *ma'aloth* is implied in the manner of travel of the feast-pilgrimages themselves, and furnished by them with a much better *raison d'être* than the assumption that "pious Hebrew traders" had become a social class of sufficient importance to account for this collection of hymns.

One serious exception to Dr. Boylan's exegesis forces itself upon the student's notice. This concerns his explanation of Psalm 108, the strongest of the Imprecatory Psalms. In common with Rotherham, a Protestant author, Dr. Boylan believes that the moral difficulty so generally observed in the terrible imprecations of vv. 6-19 has no actual existence. For in this passage he sees, not the Psalmist's prediction of Divine vengeance on his ungrateful and treacherous foe, but the Psalmist's quotation of his persecutor's maledictions upon him. Certainly, the theory is attractive, and the several bits of evidence for it adduced from the context are somewhat plausible, though far from convincing, especially the arguments drawn from the change of number in the pronoun, and from the word *pe'ullah* ("opus") in v. 20. Dr. Boylan also acknowledges the difficulty of supposing that vv. 15-17 could be asserted of the Psalmist by another; but this, he thinks, may be sheer misrepresentation on the accuser's part.

There is, however, an insuperable objection to this interpretation. The malediction in v. 8, "Let another take his office", is cited in Acts 1:20, as Dr. Boylan notes; but that citation is no mere "application of this verse to Judas by St. Peter" (p. 220). For St. Peter is there recorded as having prefaced his use of the verse with these words: "Oportet impleri Scripturam, *quam praedixit Spiritus Sanctus* per os David *de Juda.*" Therefore, according to St. Peter, engaged in an office of no less moment than the promotion and direction of the choice of a twelfth Apostle, both the defection of Judas from his "epi-

scopatus" and the supply of a successor were "foretold by the Holy Ghost" in the words of the eighth verse of this Psalm. They must, therefore, pertain to the inspired affirmation of the Psalmist; and hence, if cited from another source, must have the Psalmist's approval as his own sentiment. Now, if Dr. Boylan's interpretation be correct, the whole section including v. 8 is a direct citation of another's words by the Psalmist, and furthermore, a citation not only not approved and made his own by the sacred writer, but *by him implicitly branded as unjust and false*. This would place the eighth verse outside the category of all prediction by the Holy Ghost, whether historically or typically such. For the Psalmist would, in Dr. Boylan's supposition, have been inspired to record the words of his enemy, but not as his own affirmation, and therefore not as that of the Inspirer. This conclusion, however—inevitable from Dr. Boylan's premises—cannot possibly be reconciled with the inspired testimony of Acts 1 : 16-20. Needless to remark, such an impossibility makes Dr. Boylan's interpretation untenable, though it is equally superfluous to observe that nothing more culpable than inadvertence on the part of so excellent an author could account for the mistake.

All in all, Dr. Boylan's two volumes may confidently be pronounced the best commentary on the Psalms in English. If this verdict be justified, it means much to users of the work. For the Psalter, more than any other portion of the Old Testament, enters through the Liturgy into the inner life of the Catholic, and to know it better is to pray in fuller accord with the Church herself.

* * *

Among the works in New Testament literature of recent date we can for the present here notice only the following: 1. St. Paul to the Ephesians by Fr. Vosté, O.P., professor of New Testament Exegesis in the Collegio Angelico, Rome.[6] Fr. Vosté has gone to the approved sources for his commentary on this difficult Epistle. The homilies of St. John Chrysostom, the commentaries of St. Jerome, St. Thomas, Cajetan, and Estius are copiously and appositely cited, without neglecting the best works among modern exegetes. The Epistle is in reality St.

[6] Commentarius in Epistolam ad Ephesios, auctore Fr. Jacobo-Maria Vosté, O.P., Romae: Libreria del Collegio Angelico, Via S. Vitale.

Paul's *Tractatus de Ecclesia* in which he sets forth the idea of a building, solidly placed upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, with Christ as the cornerstone. Of particular interest and value is the author's excursus on Ephesians 5 : 32, in which he dwells upon the Vulgate rendering of the Greek term *mysterion* by *sacramentum.* We cannot entirely agree with Fr. Vosté's opinion that the Epistle to the Ephesians, in our Canon, is identical with the long-lost Epistle to the Laodiceans.[7] This was the opinion of Marcion, revived by Harnack and endorsed by some modern commentators. In spite of the fact that the opening expression, "En Epheso," may be allowed not to have been contained in the original, the arguments advanced do not seem sufficiently conclusive to set aside the traditional view that our present Epistle to the Ephesians was originally directed solely to the Church of Ephesus, or else was intended as an encyclical for several churches, one of which certainly was Ephesus.

Evangile selon Saint Marc, by the Jesuit Father Joseph Huby,[8] is a popular interpretation of the Petrine doctrine written by John Mark of Jerusalem. The author maintains the traditional priority of St. Mark's Gospel to that of St. Luke and explains the classical text of St. Ireneus indicating the contrary as referring to the preaching of St. Peter in general. For the rest, Père Huby's commentary is not designed to be a polemical treatise, though he does not ignore the position of the higher criticism which fails to prove the theory of definite prior sources.

The Gospel of St. John, by Professor Benjamin W. Robinson, proposes to sum up the results of comments on the Gospel since Westcott's day, forty years ago. He holds to the "Presbyter John" theory in accounting for the authorship of the Gospel, assuming, as is demonstrated from Papias, Polycarp, Ireneus and Eusebius, that John the Apostle had died too early to write the Ephesian Gospel. Of recent Catholic writers the author takes no account, Loisy being his only reference.

[7] Cf. Col., 4 : 16.

[8] Gabriel Beauchesne, Paris.

Criticisms and Notes.

PETRUS CANISIUS, DEUTSCHLAND'S ZWEITER APOSTEL. EIN CHARACTERBILD. Von Johannes Metzler, S.J. Mit einem Titelbild, einer Karte, und 120 Abbildungen im Text. B. Kühlen, München-Gladbach.

This certainly is a remarkable life of a saint. Miracles play a very subordinate part in it. One feels that the able author could have filled many more pages with the narration of visions and other extraordinary events in St. Peter's earthly career. We hear indeed of the high degree of his union with God, of his devotion to the Sacred Heart, the Immaculate Virgin, and the Guardian Angels of persons, cities, and countries. We receive a vivid though brief report of the heavenly communications granted to St. Peter at the time when he chose his vocation, and when his superiors had destined him to the apostolate in Germany. We are also enabled to observe him during his last years, when bodily infirmity had made him unfit for physical exertions. St. Peter Canisius appears to be a man of uninterrupted prayer, a lover of the brotherhood, even of the brotherhood of those that had strayed from the Faith.

But while all this is brought out clearly in its place, and is written everywhere between the lines, the bulk of the carefully composed biography is a description of the ceaseless activity carried on by the Apostle for half a century to stem and roll back the wave of defection which had already engulfed nearly half of the Germany of his time and threatened to involve the rest in the same destruction. The impression made upon the reader is truly overwhelming. The amount of labors shouldered by St. Peter, and the successes achieved by him seem incredible.

The author arranges his matter chiefly by topics: St. Peter Canisius as the renewer of institutions of learning; as preacher and catechist; as writer and scholar; as adviser of ecclesiastical and secular rulers. These topics show the many-sidedness and versatility of this highly gifted priest. It is difficult to say which chapter is the most fascinating. Let us briefly observe him as preacher and catechist. His numerous travels, for whatever purpose undertaken, were also missionary journeys. His great renown as messenger of the Word of God prepared the way for him to the pulpit wherever he went, and he never missed a chance to preach to high and low. At the Imperial Diets frequently the greatest men of the time sat at his feet. But he preached with equal willingness, nay preferably, to the poor, the servants, and the children. When he could snatch an hour

from the deliberations of the mighty, he found his way to some school, or he knew how to gather the children around him in other places, even in the streets. He spoke to the children in their own language, and he gave addresses in Latin, sometimes whole cycles of them, to the students of higher institutions, at Ingolstadt, Vienna, Crakaw, Cologne, Dillingen, and elsewhere. In the intermission of his regular occupations he would go to abandoned parishes, and neither fatigue nor the severe cold of winter could keep him from working incessantly, until he had reformed some neglected part of the Lord's vineyard. For seven years he preached in the cathedral of Augsburg, and was repeatedly seen in the pulpits of the cathedrals of Vienna, Prague, Ratisbon, Worms, Cologne, Strassburg, and Würzburg. Emperor Ferdinand I and the Duke of the Tyrol were for a long time his regular hearers. But he managed also to get admission to the prisons, and once proudly wrote that in one prison he acted as if he were the appointed pastor of the prisoners. The thirty-one hand-written volumes of his sermons and sketches testify to the care with which he prepared his addresses. His language was always polished, and according to the subject mild or forceful, and his sonorous voice greatly enhanced the efficiency of his words. The subjects he chose were those of importance both for the theoretical knowledge of the Faith, such as his audience required, and for a practical Christian life of virtue and devotion. It was natural that he often discussed the doctrines impugned by the heretics. But he did so by giving a genuine explanation of the Catholic teaching and supporting it by solid proofs from Scripture and Tradition. He is sometimes called the "Hammer of Heretics". He should rather be called "Hammer of Heresies", because whenever he had to deal with erring souls, he was no hammer, but tried to win them by kindness and patience.

It might seem that these efforts were enough to fill out a man's time. But the other chapters inform us that during the half-century of his apostolate he issued more than thirty separate publications, many of which, above all his catechism, required constant attention, improvement, and revision; that he gave generous assistance to a score of other writers; that his letters fill eight heavy volumes in print; that the tasks imposed upon him by popes and other ecclesiastic and secular rulers demanded much study, consideration, and traveling; that from 1556-1580 he was practically a regular member of the Imperial Diets; that the number of his journeys (represented on a specially devised map) is next to uncountable—and in view of these facts his preaching activity appears almost as a side-issue. It has been said that Martin Luther possessed a remarkable capacity for work. But Luther's labors cannot be in any way compared with the

work accomplished by his saintly antagonist, let alone the untold hours Saint Peter Canisius gave to his spiritual exercises and the conversation with God.

A peculiar feature of Father Metzler's book is the very great number of illustrations. In fact, besides being a dextrously woven biography, it is also a Canisius Picture Book. Striking among the pictures is the number of portraits of the saint, the dates of which show that the veneration for him was constant during four centuries. A stained-glass window is still extant which was made during the saint's lifetime, in 1591. The next two centuries contributed seventeen and ten different pictures respectively. Especially productive were the last half of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century. It seems that the beatification, which took place in 1864, greatly increased the devotion to him and the appreciation of his blessed activity. Very many pictures, both old and new, exhibit the saint as writer, or in the attitude of preacher or teacher, or as catechist surrounded by children. These pictures will give suggestions to those who may wish to see the new saint represented in churches and chapels, or in religious or educational institutions.

Fr. Metzler's book is indeed an enthusing survey of the life of St. Peter, and well adapted to the preparation of sermons and lectures. But the arrangement by topics has its drawbacks. We would advise those who wish to understand fully the lifework of the "Second Apostle of Germany", to take up also Father O. Braunsberger's biography of the saint, which rather accurately follows him from birth to death, and thereby shows the interrelation of his many great and small enterprises, and places them in the several stages and periods of his long and eventful career.

Although by no means alone in the struggle, and only for thirteen years in the position of superior (Provincial) within his own Order, Saint Peter Canisius was the soul of nearly all great measures undertaken for the defence of the Church. He excelled in the council chamber and in the field of action. But while a born leader, gifted with all the prudence, courage, boldness, caution, and keenness of vision required in a commander, he never disdained to be soldier of the rank and file. The countries to which he devoted his indomitable energy, and for which he so incessantly prayed and labored, forget that they are now cut apart by the cold lines of political boundaries, unite in the expressions of veneration and gratitude, and rejoice in the glory bestowed by Pope Pius XI upon Saint Peter Canisius.

FRANCIS S. BETTEN, S.J.

THE NEW PSYCHOLOGY. How it Aids and Interests. By E. Boyd Barrett, S.J., M.A., Ph.D., Professor of Psychology, Georgetown University. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. 1925. Pp. ix—358.

PSYCHOLOGIE ET PSYCHOTHERAPIE EDUCATIVES. Par L'Abbé Arnauld d'Agnel et le Docteur d'Espiney. Pierre Téqui, Paris. 1924. Pp. 608.

REFLEXIONS SUR L'INTELLIGENCE ET SUR SA VIE PROPRE. Par Jacques Maritain. Nouvelle Librairie Nationale, Paris. 1924. Pp. 378.

Three books mutually supplementary. They have psychology for their common subject matter. They are differentiated by this, that the first studies human nature, or rather, the human personality, by aid of the newest analytical methods; the second overlaps the first at several points and utilizes the same method but chiefly on the plane of pedagogy; the third deals exclusively with the intellectual faculty in itself and in certain of its applications.

Father Barrett's *The New Psychology* had been heralded for some time in advance of its coming and it stands no little to its credit that it has been able to fulfill the promises of its *avant-courriers.* For, although one takes with due allowance the "blurb's" announcement that the "book is epoch-making", in strict sobriety one must recognize that it is a valuable addition to our rather meagre list of works devoted to its subject. Aside from Dr. Moore's recent *Dynamic Psychology* and Dr. Bruehl's brief but able brochure on *Psycho-analysis,* there is little on the subject in English that can be safely recommended. Father Barrett covers substantially the same ground as Dr. Moore, but his method and style are rather more popular and will appeal therefore to a class of readers who need and will be satisfied with a less technical analysis of psycho-analysis.

When Experimental Psychology came forth from the German laboratories some fifty years ago it was hailed by many as marking a new epoch in the science of man, as reducing psychology to a natural science—converting it indeed into a "psychology without a soul". On the other hand many regarded the new science with suspicion, pronouncing it materialistic and identifying it with physiology. After a while, as students got more used to the new methods, Physiological Psychology came to receive a place in the gallery of the sciences, and ever since even our Latin manuals have been assimilating more or less of the new to the old psychology. However, the new psychology emanating from the laboratories of Weber, Fechner, and Wundt in Germany, and of James, Titchener and Baldwin in

America, must not be confounded with the later new psychology which Freud discovered some forty years ago and which has since not only captured the imagination of professional workers but has seized upon popular sentiment the world around and poured into the modern languages a stream of new vocables which demand special glossaries to interpret them. The elder new psychology analyzed the forms of consciousness mainly by the objective and external method and was chiefly interested in sensuous presentations and representations.

The latest new psychology is concerned mainly with the subconscious life of man and with his instinctive, affective and emotional complexes. Abnormal states, psycho-neuroses, hysteria, obsessions, auto-suggestions, and kindred mental peculiarities likewise occupy much attention. The subconscious life it has proved to be the storehouse in which man hides or conserves most of his mental possessions: the cellar into which he thrusts his egotistic images, feelings, loves, hates, and desires—all the nasty things that putrify and send their noxious gases up through the chinks into his living rooms—his kitchen, his parlor, even into his bed-chamber (the home of uncanny dreams), and into his garret (the lumber-room of forgotten memories). Breathing unconsciously these moldy and decaying complexes, he is attacked by all kinds of elusive neuroses, hysterias, obsessions, scruples, neurasthenias, and all the other psycho-morbidities. The worst of it all is that most people do not know a tithe of the ugly things they have cluttered into this subterranean cavern, and when they want to clean the whole thing out they find standing at the cellar door a wily "censor" who tries to induce them not to attempt the proposed house-cleaning or purgating, but just to stay dozing away in their neurotic booze.

It is just here that the psycho-analyst comes in to save them from their submerged selfishness, if haply they will let him expel the "censor" and enable him to let light and air into the darksome crannies of their buried selves. The psycho-analyst, if virtuous, prudent and expert, can do them good by ridding them of the poisons which infest their subconsciousness. Father Barrett explains in sufficient detail most of what is really known or even conjectured regarding this subterranean region—what mysterious things it hides and how its intimate secrets can be revealed by judicious psycho-analysis. He says many interesting and curious things concerning auto-suggestion, the revelatory aspects of dreams, the mysteries of hypnotism; how the disorders lurking in the latent self may be reached and treated by psychotherapy; and how its better qualities may be brought to the surface and developed by sound education. His book, the outcome of much research, reading and reflection, will

be of special service to priests, spiritual guides and teachers, religious and lay, who possess the intelligence and the prudence that are indispensable for applying the principles and suggested methods to so delicate an operation as is that of exploring the intimate recesses and secrets of the soul.

The second book above, while traversing much of the same ground as the foregoing, enters more fully into its own specialty, which is the psychology of education and educational psychotherapy. The joint production of a priest and a physician, each thoroughly informed and experienced in his respective field, the work commends itself as thoroughly scientific, sound, and practical. The authors have put to good use the safest results of the new psychology, and they have produced a book that will be welcomed by spiritual guides and educators, parents and teachers—all who share in the responsibility and the privilege of training the child and the adolescent. Solidly learned, the treatise is written in a style that makes the reading agreeable as well as profitable. The book is thoroughly indexed and equipped with a copious bibliography.

Passing to the third volume above is like rising from the lower valleys and the wooded flanks to the higher ranges of the Alps. You are breathing a new, a fresher, a purer air. You are scanning wider horizons, you are viewing the nether world in just perspectives and due proportions. You have reached the higher altitudes of pure metaphysics. And, lest you fail to notice the new conditions, your guide gives you due warning: "Dès qu'il s'agit du domaine propre de l'intelligence, il faut dire aux passants de bonne volonté: que nul n'entre ici s'il n'est pas métaphysicien." Here is no hunt for complexes, no scenting of neuroses, no psycho-analysis of dreams and haunting delusions. Instead, you penetrate into the white light of consciousness wherein blend the prismatic colors of the sense-world, the intellectual object which is being, truth, and the activity of the faculty whereby it is grasped, be it in the sphere of abstract ideas or in those very kaleidoscopic phenomena which psycho-analysis itself brings to light. Such at least is the trend of the two chapters which deal respectively with truth and intellectual activity in particular. The author then turns the conclusions he has reached upon certain obscurations of genuine intellectivity occasioned by the speculations of such theorists as Maurice Blondel; and, as regards the preparation for the act of faith, by Paschal; in physico-mathematics by Descartes; and more recently by Einstein; and in its pragmatic misinterpretation by William James and the Pluralists. The analysis of intellectual activity viewed under these varied relations leads up

to a synthetic presentation of the subject as afforded by Thomistic realism.

The following lines may serve to suggest the spirit and temper in which Professor Maritain envisages the matter: "Le bienveillant lecteur nous permettra maintenant de l'avertir que cet ouvrage ne saurait avoir d'intérêt, ou même de signification, que pour les esprits qui reconnaissent la légitimité et la primauté du point de vue métaphysique. Les problèmes qui concernent la nature et la valeur de la connaissance ne sont pas, comme le croient aujourd' hui tant de gens fascinés par l'illusions de 'concret vécu', du ressort de la psychologie, et d'une étude, même "transcendantale" (?) du contenu de la conscience. Ils revélent du métaphysicien, je veux dire, qu'ils dépendent d'une lumière qui est celle du degré d'abstraction métaphysique. La métaphysique du connaître forme normalement l'introduction de la métaphysique de l'être." Solid and profound, like the author's earlier philosophical dissertations, this the latest deserves the distinguished place assigned to it in the *Bibliothèque Française de Philosophie.*

JUS CANONICUM, auctore F. X. Wernz, S.J., ad Codicis normam exactam, opera Petri Vidal, S.J. Tomus V, Jus Matrimoniale. Romae: apud aedes Univ. Gregorianae. 1925.

The long-awaited revision of Wernz's classical work presents the most complete and satisfactory treatment of the tract on Matrimony in accordance with the new legislation. It is well that the author has delayed the revision, as the delay has afforded him an opportunity to examine and pass a critical judgment on the opinions of late authors on disputed points.

The manifold changes in matrimonial legislation in recent years have caused no little confusion in the minds of the clergy. Indeed, the past twenty years have been productive of more changes than the past three hundred. To treat with the requisite knowledge the various cases presented to him, as the court of first resort, so to speak, a parish priest of our generation must be familiar with the Tridentine legislation, the *Ne temere* legislation on espousals and the form of marriage, and the legislation of the Code. No work on Matrimony can be acceptable in our day unless it takes cognizance of all three, as "leges respiciunt futura, non praeterita", and the validity of a marriage is judged by the legislation under which it was contracted. A comparison of the Code and pre-Code legislation, e. g. on the diriment impediments of ecclesiastical law, discovers the radical nature of the changes that have been effected. Even the *Ne temere* legislation, promulgated in 1908 with a view to its future in-

clusion in the Code, is found there with several not unimportant modifications.

Fr. Vidal was peculiarly fitted for the work of revision, having collaborated with Fr. Wernz in the publication of the former edition. His position as a member of the Commission for the Codification of Canon Law, his presence on the Commission for the Interpretation of the Canons of the Code, and his membership on various Roman Congregations lend added weight to his conclusions.

Fr. Vidal has followed the general plan of Wernz's work, with its valuable historical background, and its copious reference to authorities. All the changes are clearly indicated, and disputed points lucidly discussed, without a slavish adherence to opinions proposed in the former edition.

One marvels at the completeness of the work. What the preface says of the pre-Code work loses none of its application in the revision: "Scarcely a case occurs for whose solution this eminent work does not provide the light of learning." A striking example of this is found in the discussion of the obligation of espousals (pp. 116 ff.).

Of greater practical interest to us is the discussion with regard to the impotence of women deprived of uterus and ovaries. In the former edition Wernz held that the affirmative opinion should be preferred. Vidal holds the measured opinion that theoretically they are not impotent; practically, in view of the divergence of opinions, the impotence is doubtful, and marriage cannot be prevented, in view of Canon 1028, § 2. To explain the opposition between the opinions held in the former and present editions, Fr. Vidal is compelled to place Fr. Wernz in a rather unfavorable light, since, in the heat of the controversy then raging in his own house, says Fr. Vidal, "we know for certain that the opinion he expressed was not the opinion actually in his mind".

Other interesting points discussed under impediments are the subjection of the children of non-Catholics to the impediment of disparity of worship (p. 304), the existence of the impediment of affinity among infidels (p. 439), the relationship of civil marriage to the impediment of "publica honestas" (p. 454), and the inclusion of sponsors in private baptisms under the impediment of spiritual relationship (p. 470). The frequent appeal for authoritative decisions indicates the uncertainty still felt on many points of legislation.

In the section on matrimonial consent, the very full discussion on consent conditioned by marital continence is worthy of special note (pp. 614 ff.).

Under the form of marriage, Fr. Vidal opposes in a restrained way the opinion, proposed by Vlaming as probable, that the delega-

tion intimated by the general "ratio agendi" of the parochus, may be considered as given expressly, without being written or oral. The opinion of Vlaming, however, is further assisted by a comparison with Canon 874, where it is stated that the delegation of jurisdiction for confessions must be "scripto vel verbis expresse concessa". This seems to amplify the *expresse,* and to imply that delegation may be given *expresse,* without the necessity of being written or oral.

An examination of the discussion in the matrimonial cases submitted to the Holy See in recent years will testify to the increasing esteem in which Wernz's work is held. No matrimonial court, indeed no parish priest, can well be without this scholarly revision. A geographical error has crept in on page 310, where Savannah is placed in Canada.

DE MATRIMONIO ET CAUSIS MATRIMONIALIBUS. Tractatus Canonico-Moralis juxta Codicem Juris Canonici. P. Nicolaus Farrugia, O.S.A. Pietro Marietti. 1924.

Less pretentious in form, and without the apparatus of erudition which distinguishes the work of Wernz-Vidal, Fr. Farrugia's work will be welcomed for its clear and succinct explanation of the canons on matrimony. He goes through the canons in order, devoting himself not only to an explanation of the legislation, but to a discussion of the reasons which prompted it. In addition, the moral aspect of the canons is abundantly treated, thus giving a complete treatise on the Sacrament of Matrimony.

Attention may be called to the copious discussion on impotence where, against the weight of recent authority, he maintains the impotence of the "mulier excisa", and to the sound exposition of the Church's teaching on the "usus matrimonii" and the education of children.

The print of the book is excellent, and a full index, with a list of the canons explained, adds greatly to its utility. The work is sponsored by Cardinal Lega, in itself no slight recommendation.

THE FOUR GOSPELS. A Study of Origins, treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship and Dates. By Burnett Hillman Streeter, D.D., Edinb. Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, Canon of Hereford, Author of "Restatement and Reunion," etc. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1925.

Many a Catholic scholar will be glad to have this book, though he may regard the author's position as departing in a measure from the authoritative conclusions of the Biblical Commission which defines the doctrinal attitude of the faithful regarding the historical

origin of the four Gospels. It is a wise if not infallible provision that the traditional belief regarding the order and composition of the Sacred Books is to be maintained so long as there is no decisively convincing evidence to the contrary. Meanwhile exegetical and hermeneutical science demands that the mature student take cognizance of the varying and opposing opinions regarding the mooted hypotheses of oral and written traditions or the dependence of the one Gospel on the other.

Canon Streeter shows himself to be thoroughly familiar with what has been argued on the side of the so-called higher criticism of the rationalist school and also regarding the doctrine of an uncompromising acceptance of the Divine inspiration touching the Bible. He starts from a survey of what textual criticism, source analysis, and a study of the cultural background of the early Church, together with recent inquiry into the psychology of Mysticism, have done to establish the historical character of the Gospels. He himself takes position with the believer in Divine inspiration, and explains that gift to the sacred writers in a way which, though novel, is likely to commend itself to many minds. He accepts and beautifully illustrates the teaching of the Gospel as coming from the Son of God, born of a Virgin. With these prepossessions he offers to throw new light upon the Synoptic problem and to explain the mystico-historical character of the Fourth Gospel.

While our author disposes of "the troublesome phantom of an *Ur-Marcus*" assumed by German critics, he strongly advocates the theory that Mark was one of the sources used by Matthew and Luke, whose authorship of the Gospels, as they have come to us under their names, cannot be questioned with any show of external or internal evidence. But the chief claim to originality in the volume before us is the emphasized proposition of "a Four Document Hypothesis" with the result of weakening the old "Two Document" hypothesis which assigns Mark and the Logia as the basis of the synoptical account. In place of the latter assumption Dr. Streeter argues that the available evidence, if examined without undue prejudice in favor of the two-source theory, rather demonstrates in St. Matthew the record of traditions as they were current at Jerusalem, whereas St. Luke traces his sources mainly to Cæsarea. Both evangelists, however, draw upon the accounts authoritatively received in the two important centres of the Apostolic missions, namely Antioch and Rome. Even Catholic modern exegetical bias strongly inclines to the endorsement of our author's argument, all the more as he is in no wise apodictic, but presents his evidence with the tentative reserve of the true scholar.

It would lead beyond the customary limits of a notice of recent works in these pages to point out details of agreement and of criti-

cism. A word, however, should be said regarding Dr. Streeter's estimate of the fourth Gospel, both as to its authorship and in its relation to the Synoptics. While, according to him, the doctrine and genius of the Johannine writings are undoubtedly those of the Beloved Disciple, our author argues that they are written by a disciple of the Apostle, resident at Ephesus, who in his work idealizes his teacher, the Apostle John. Since the inspired character of the fourth Gospel like that of the Epistles (three) and the Apocalypse is in no way questioned, this would be somewhat analogous to the fifth Book of Moses, presumably written by the inspired Joshua. The theory of the Elder John, thus writing as it were in the name, not under the dictation of the Apostle, would indeed explain many passages in patristic commentaries, leaving St. John at Jerusalem while identifying with him the disciple at Ephesus. This might also explain the writing in Greek, while the thought was Aramaic. How far such a view affects the belief in an Apostolic authorship may be questioned by conservative Catholic scholarship, though it will seem compatible with the traditional orthodox position to others.

In pointing out the connexion between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics, Dr. Streeter draws some quite logical inferences to show that criticism of the Johannine chronology as conflicting with that of the other Evangelists is largely exaggerated, and that the fourth Gospel solves more chronological difficulties than it questions. For the rest, even if we admit a certain dependence of St. John upon Mark and Luke, the true authorship of the former is not thereby fundamentally affected. Mark, Luke and John form a series, with a progressive tendency to emphasize the universal element in Christian teaching. Altogether, the Oxford scholar opens new avenues of historical inquiry to the Biblical student. Nor is what he says about St. Jerome's corrections of the Latin versions and their relation to the Greek copies of his day without special significance to those interested in a revision of our present Vulgate text.

PAGAN AND CHRISTIAN RULE. By Dom Hugh G. Bevenot, O.S.B., B.A. With an introduction by Hilaire Belloc. Longmans, Green and Co.: London and New York. 1924. Pp. 183.

"It is sufficiently clear to those who survey Europe in the mass and follow the full outline of their time that our civilization must return to the Faith or be destroyed." A hard saying it may seem at first hearing, yet not too severe as to be improbable, nor one to which so judicious a writer as Hilaire Belloc would lend the authority of his name without weighty reasons. The evidence upon which the judgment rests is in the first place philosophical. The inevitably disintegrating forces of the steadily advancing scepticism in

regard to all supernatural and indeed even all philosophical truth—a scepticism logically as well as psychologically entailed by the widely prevailing and continually advancing materialism and consequent sensualism characteristic of "modern thought"—must of necessity bring about a reversion not simply to paganism, but, as Mr. Belloc words it, "by a short cut to savagery".

Nothing of course is easier than to damn such a judgment by dubbing it "pessimistic". That epithet, however, does not destroy the public records of ever-multiplying crimes and other nameless immoralities. The only power that can effectively and enduringly react against the anti-social forces is organized Catholicism. For the members of the Church this conclusion reads like a truism; for those outside her pale, like the empty vaunting of arrogance. The evidence for the truth of the judgment must therefore be sought, not in *a priori* reasoning, but in historical experience. It is entirely to such experience that appeal is made in the volume at hand.

The author's aim is to analyze certain stages in the development of European civilization in order to let the ascertained facts convey their obvious lessons. These stages are, in the first place, the age of Augustus when pagan rule, culminating in universal peace, attained its highest degree of material civilization and literary culture —an eminence, however, which failed to protect the mistress of the world from the destructive invasions of the barbarians. In the second stage, the age of Theodosius, the principles and the methods of Christianity are seen leavening a resurgent society. Great Christian leaders, such as Ambrose, Damasus, and Theodosius himself, stand out as personal forces effecting and conserving by their principles, their work and their example a higher degree of moral as well as intellectual perfection. The influence of the Church at its best is studied in the third stage, the thirteenth century. That influence is shown to have been particularly furthered and fostered by the ninth Louis of France and the third Edward of England; and to have been felt not only in the permeation of Christendom with a vigorous faith but no less in a widening and a deepening of charity; in the multiplication of beneficence of every kind and order; in great industrial progress through the guild system, "and in a far-reaching wonderful extension of popular liberties".

This is all very well, it may be said. On the other hand, if the Church exercised such an uplifting influence in the middle ages, why did she not retain her vantage ground? Is she not held responsible for the scandals, the set-backs, the schisms whereby millions have found themselves wilfully or otherwise alienated from at least outward communion with her? (p. 140). Dom Bevenot recognizes the speciousness of the difficulty and proceeds to answer it in detail. He finds a general answer in the instinctive repugnance to

authority and self-discipline inherent in human nature. Particular reasons he shows to have existed in the remnants of Roman paganism, in the Teutonic superstitions that survived with the new nations, in the influence of feudalism and in the subtle opposition of statecraft. For the explication of these reasons we must refer the reader to the author, as also for the very satisfactory study of the influence exercised by the Church on the individual mind, especially through her philosophy, and upon the nations.

Taking the book as a whole, it may be described as an epitome of the philosophy of Christian history. The treatment commends itself for its reasonableness and moderation. It holds the safe middle between the extremes. While laying bare the evils festering within the social organism, it shuns alike the glooms of a morbid pessimism and the garish lights of a Utopian optimism.

As an illustration of how the author's own note of moderation copies that of the Church itself, the following passage deserves notice, and that the more because at the same time it serves as a sample of the literary form pervading the general treatment. He is speaking of the conciliatory spirit of Catholic philosophy.

> "St. Bernard was alarmed at the intellectualism of Abelard, but St. Thomas reconciled that 'modernizing' tendency with the faith. Bishops were alarmed at the intellectualism of Lacordaire, but it has rendered eminent service to the faith. In the nineteenth century the Church sent out her heralds to convene the contending schools of thought and dogma to a peace conference. Such heralds will she send forth in our own century. How will the call be heard? Surely as well, if not better, than at the call made by Newman. For, firstly, the recent war has rudely shown the hollowness of many principles of the time-spirit; it has made many thinkers sadder and wiser. And, secondly, there is a seeking for a philosophy more positive than pantheism or monism, less crude than mere materialism. This has led logically to a revived interest in Thomism and Aristotelianism, and justifies our hopes. On the other hand, the Church has outgrown what was medieval in Thomism. Even as there is development in her doctrine, so will her philosophy be gradually formulated with greater perfection, and above all be rendered more fully intelligible, illuminating to those who are philosophic foreigners. Indeed, the Catholic neo-Scholastic movement has already begun, and this is a step toward the realization of the great Catholic synthesis of the future, with a wider outlook than that of the thirteenth century, but ever from the same lofty standpoint, the Rock of Peter" (p. 159).

READINGS FROM ST. AUGUSTINE ON THE PSALMS. By Joseph Rickaby, S.J. New York: Benziger Brothers. 1925. Pp. xii—259.

Probably most of us know St. Augustine's *Enarrationes in Psalmos* only through excerpts given in the Breviary. And knowing them only thus, it may come as a surprise to learn that quantitatively they fill a folio volume of some seventeen hundred pages, while qualitatively they are, after "the Confessions, the most beautiful of St. Augustine's writings" (p. v). The breverial specimens, while they evoke in the cleric admiration for the subtle mind that could discover so many mysterious meanings hidden below the surface of the inspired psalmody, may not always satisfy either the intellectual or the devotional sense of the modern reader, habituated as he is apt to be to seek for the literal meaning of the text and preferring as he may to develop his own accommodations. At the same time it should be remembered that, as Fr. Rickaby observes, "it is often hard to tell where the mystical [if not the literal] sense of Scripture ends, and what is called the accommodated sense takes its place". And it must be granted that the great Western Doctor possessed an almost instinctive insight into the inner meanings of the Scriptures. Though these meanings are not the literal and primary sense, they may well have been inclusively intended by the inspiring Author, quite aside from the applications or accommodations which human writers might assign.

Be all this as it may, the present collection of *Readings* will probably come to many not simply as a surprise but as an intellectual and devotional treat. A surprise, because of the unsuspected wealth of the thoughts; and a treat because of their mental value and their spiritual nutritiousness. Fr. Rickaby, as we have been taught by his former works covering similar lines, possesses the art of translating in a high degree of perfection. In the present case he has not only rendered the thought of the great original faithfully and clearly, but by a certain note of quaintness and graceful distinction he has made the version if anything even more winsome than the original. St. Augustine had no intention of writing a commentary on the Psalms. He simply selects verses here and there and makes them the vehicle of his own reflections, irrespective of the original meaning. These reflections, emanating from a mind so penetrating and so rich in many-sided culture, could hardly be anything else but illuminative and spiritually nutritious. Fr. Rickaby has made a wise selection from these valuable "thoughts" and rendered them in graceful form. The collection will be serviceable for meditation and spiritual reading.

Literary Chat.

Fr. Fulgence Meyer of the Cincinnati Province of Friars Minor has prepared a volume of Retreat Lectures and Readings for Religious and Priests, under the title *Uni Una*, which is the brief Latin formula for "to the one God my one soul". Bishop Chartrand, in his preface to the book, dwells on the antecedents of the popular missionary, suggestive of the eminent qualifications as a retreat-master whose theology and practical view of the spiritual life may be relied upon. The special topics presented are such as answer the purpose of spiritual reading during the exercises of a retreat. They are in fact the results of Fr. Meyer's method and teaching in giving retreats, especially for nuns and tertians. An inviting feature of the thirty-three addresses, which include not only the fundamental topics of spiritual recollection as part of the ordinary retreat exercises, but also sermons on occasion of religious reception and profession, and of Jubilee celebration, is the manner of subdivisions under separate headlines. These facilitate the reading and meditation. St. Anthony's Monastery (Cincinnati), which fathers the publication, is to be congratulated on the good make-up of the volume.

Dr. John G. Vance of St. Edmund's College, Old Hall, jointly with the Hon. J. W. Fortescue, has done a beautiful piece of biographical work, issued in elegant book form, as *A Memoir of the late Adrian Fortescue*. It gives a vivid picture, enhanced by the colored portrait of the man, the writer, the speaker, scholar, priest, and friend. To this are added notes of dates, facts, and a survey of the singularly gifted and equally retiring English priest to whom modern scholarship owes a greater debt than has yet been acknowledged. We give but one illustration, which suffices to show with what intellectual preparation and forecast of future work he entered the sacred priesthood. In 1896, when about to receive Minor Orders, at the age of twenty-two, he sketched for himself the following plan of Study in Free Time, for the succeeding four years:

"Jan. 1896-July 1896: Modern Greek.

Vacations 1896: Classical and Modern Greek Grammar.

Oct. 1896-July 1897: Greek—Italian.

Vacations 1897: Hungarian.

Oct. 1897-July 1898: Hungarian.

Vacations 1898: Sanscrit.

Oct. 1898-July 1899: Sanscrit.

Vacations 1899: Sanscrit.

Oct. 1899-1900: Icelandic.

Vacations 1900: Icelandic — Old English.

"If God spares me."

His chief studies as an ecclesiastic before his ordination, and for some years after it, were made in Germany; and his first appointment in England by Cardinal Vaughan was to the German Church at Whitechapel. Later he took up the study of Arabic and Hebrew, and in 1908 began his literary work, chiefly in ecclesiastical history and liturgy. His writings abound in marks of scientific and original research, while at the same time they were directed toward practical issues in apologetics and polemical theology. (Burns, Oates and Washbourne: London.)

A recent French biography of special interest to parish priests, because it shows how wide the beneficent influence of a zealous pastor may extend, is *Gabriel Deshayes et ses familles religieuses* by the Vicar General of Meaux, Mgr. Laveille. P. Deshayes was born in 1767 and died in 1841. His devotion to the schools, his care for the poor and unfortunate, especially the deaf-mutes, and his zeal to uphold the honor of the Church, led him to found a number of societies, and to revive others which had lost their fervor or which were suppressed by a hostile government. Among the latter were the institutes founded by Blessed Grignon de Montfort, to whose beatification he largely contributed by preaching and writing, though he did not live to witness the ceremony. Mgr. Laveille, aided by the abbé Collin, has thrown

fresh light on his subject, and corrected some erroneous statements of previous biographers after an impartial study of original documents. (Pierre Téqui: Paris.)

Father Garesché is a specialist on Sodalities. He has already published (through the Messrs. Benziger Brothers) several volumes of instructions on the organization and work of those associations. And now comes another collection, a second series of *Sodality Conferences* (pp. 340), in which he comments with further detail on the rules and work of Sodalities, illustrating his ideas by his enlarged experience of their activities both at home and abroad. Directors as well as Sodalists themselves will find these new Conferences practically instructive and spiritually stimulating.

In *Talks with Teachers,* Sister Marie Paula, Ph.D., Associate Professor of English, Mt. St. Vincent, New York, has brought together a number of papers and essays on topics educational and generally cultural, which should be welcomed by our religious teachers. The style is simple, direct, and pleasing. Of immediate interest at this moment is the chapter on the *Summer School* (for Teachers). The writer briefly and clearly sets forth the origin, nature, the use and the abuse of this institution.

The second volume of the truly monumental work, *L'Étude Comparée des Religions,* a critical essay by Father H. Pinard de la Bouillaye, S.J., has recently appeared (Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, pp. 533). The REVIEW has previously given an account of the first volume and need here only reëmphasize the value of the work which it then signalized and add that the high standard of excellence set by the first volume is fully sustained by the second, the concluding, volume. As was pointed out in reviewing the earlier volume, the work has to do exclusively with the methodology of the study of comparative religions, not with the results or contents of the science; and when it is noticed that the learned and profound Professor Pinard has thought more than a thousand large octavo pages not too many to devote to this single topic, one may form some estimate of the importance of the undertaking. Indeed it is not too much to say that if this great work on methodology had been in the hands of the pioneers in the field a generation ago—and had been utilized by them—the science of comparative religions had not wandered into such devious ways and come upon so many "things that are not so", as has actually been its fate and has condemned it together with Sociology to a place in the gallery of the pseudo-sciences. Now, however, that this masterly guide is at hand it is to be hoped that future workers will avail themselves of its expert knowledge in pursuing their investigations and in correcting the errors of their predecessors.

Students who make the acquaintance with this unique contribution to the literature of the subject will no doubt hope that the author will still further lend his aid to the development of the contents of the science itself which he has so ably introduced.

Canon A. Tosi, editor of the Roman Quarterly *Jus Pontificium,* has done a most valuable service to students of Canon Law by publishing an Index to the Decisions of the Pontifical Commission which interprets the *Codex Juris Canonici.* His *Repertorium Juridicum Ecclesiasticum,* the first part of which covers 44 pages, gives a summary, under 278 distinct paragraphs, of the several decisions of the Commission and of the various Congregations, excepting the Rota, between the years 1918 and 1924. The references to the numbers and pages of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* are given, together with a separate "Index Canonum" and an "Index Rerum." This is what those who have to refer to the Roman discipline greatly needed.

The *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* gives annual Indices; but one cannot easily place a topic without going through all the sixteen or seventeen volumes. Moreover, the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* have not been consistently edited.

Errors in names are frequent, and other mistakes occur continually which have to be corrected. Canon Tosi is, as far as we may judge, accurate. Publications which are meant to be the authoritative norm of jurisprudential enactments and interpretations for the entire Catholic world are expected to be reliable and to observe some uniformity.

Catholic laymen in China evidently know how to combine with their clergy in promoting literary and social activity. The *Rock*, a Hongkong Catholic monthly, is published under the auspices of the Catholic Union and Catholic Men's Club. Its March issue offers some eighty pages of instructive and interesting reading, illustrated. It is indicative of permanent enterprise, since it is already in its fifth year. Credit is due to the Hongkong Church Committee, which employs the Imprimerie de Nazareth for the printing. The subscription outside China is six dollars.

The *Kolping House* in Chicago is a centre which provides for the spiritual and temporal welfare of unmarried Catholic young men. It furnishes an abode where they may enjoy the companionship of others of their faith, where they are welcome and have the benefit of friendly counsel of Catholic priests. A neat pamphlet gives information of an encouraging nature to those who may wish to do likewise elsewhere. Kolping House (811, Oakdale Ave., Chicago) is a creditable success.

The Rev. Paul A Gieringer has done excellent work in preparing *An Outline History of Christian Missions* (pp. 59), which is published in the Paladin Series under the auspices of the Catholic Students' Mission Crusade. The author traces the mission work to the time of the Ascension and Pentecostal apostolate through the Middle Ages down to our own time. There are geographical outlines and indexes to reference books that should materially assist the student of mission work.

A new writer of stories for boys comes to us with his first book, *The Last Lap*, Fergal McGrath, S.J. The scene is laid at St. Ronan's, a boarding school in Ireland. The story is vibrant with vigorous, healthy life. The action never tires. Something is doing everywhere and all the time. Athletics abound; there are scrimmages galore—even with the Black and Tan. There are some fine bits of heroism, also the unobtruded presence of an ideal that directs even the commonest events of school life to ends of permanent value. Boys will wish to hear more from Fergal McGrath.

"The years between three and seven are more important than any later educational period. If you are carefully teaching your young children for five minutes a day, you are doing more to give them a good education than the best college can ever do, because education takes its root in the wise management of the habit-forming period, the wonder-working period that reaches its greatest height between the ages of three and seven." Which simply says that the education of the child must be deeply laid in the home and chiefly by the mother, and therefore that the education of mothers is the main concern of the nation and the Church." The foregoing bit of wisdom is taken from a recent publication entitled *Beginning the Child's Education*, by Ella Frances Lynch (New York: Harper & Brothers, pp. 202). The book is made up of a collection of letters between the mother of little Esther, a child of three, and the author. The number of books on child education is large enough to fill a large library, but there is ample room for this latest accession to the list. The pastor who comes to know the book will spare no effort to spread it amongst the mothers of his flock.

To the collection *Les Moralistes Chrétiens* which the Librairie Lecoffre (Paris) is issuing, several noteworthy accessions have recently been made in the monographs on St. Basil (*Saint-Basile, Evêque de Césarée*, par M. l'abbé Jean Rivière, pp. 320), St. John Chrysostom (*Saint Jean Crysostome*, par M. H. Legrand, pp. 320) and *Pascal, Pensées* (par M.

Jacques Chevalier, 2 vols., pp. 320 and 319). All these are original studies of the great moral thinkers, the aim being to restate and reinforce the teachings that possess a permanent value not only for their day and environment but for all time. The study of *Pascal* is especially penetrating and brings out the central and unifying ideas of his *Apologétique* whereof the *Pensées* are the spontaneous but fragmentary expressions. No student who wants to know Pascal's real convictions "sur la verité de la religion chrétienne" can afford to pass by M. Chevalier's profound and scholarly study. To the same series of Christian moralists belongs Professor Gilson's *St. Thomas d'Aquin* (pp. 380), the English translation of which was recently reviewed in these pages.

The young maidens who are on the eve of passing into the school of life might derive both profit and pleasure by making the acquaintance of *Golden Sally,* a recent novel from the gifted pen of "M. E. Francis" (Mrs. Francis Blundell) and Agnes Blundell. Sally Derwood is a young girl pursuing studies at a boarding school conducted by nuns in England. Shortly before completing a happy scholastic term she receives a rather brusque letter from her brother Richard to the effect that she is badly needed on their ranch in Manitoba, which is being run with indifferent success by their dependent father and their weakly, slatternly stepmother. The Canadian home is unkempt, cheerless, and the kiddies are uncared for and growing up like heathens. Sally sacrifices the opportunities for completing her schooling, and the tempting prospects held out to her by her wealthy guardian, Lady Abercombie, because she feels that she should devote herself to her father. Wholly unprepared for the rough conditions to which she is introduced by her not too affectionate brother, she nevertheless grapples bravely with the domestic difficulties, which are aggravated by the incapable and utterly selfish stepmother, and eventually by almost heroic selflessness the girl succeeds in bringing something like order and sunshine into the Canadian household. Next she effects the conversion of her freakish and jealous stepmother, has the kiddies instructed and baptized, and accomplishes such other feats of beneficence as entitle her justly to deserve the endearing title of *Golden Sally.* A simple strain of love runs through a portion of the story, which is thoroughly healthy and robust, and one which our young girls facing life will do well to read (The Herder Book Co., St. Louis).

The Trail of the Iroquois, by M. Bourchier Sanford, is a stirring romance of pioneer life in Canada. The scene is laid at the Jesuit missions amongst the Hurons in the middle of the seventeenth century. Life among the Indians, the peaceful Hurons and the fierce Iroquois, and at the historic forts Ste. Marie, St. Ignace and St. Louis, the slaughter of the Christian converts and the martyrdom of the saintly Breboeuf and Lallemant are graphically described on the basis of the Jesuit *Relations.* The woof of history is shot through with the warp of a romance that weaves into the narrative the colors and patterns of human interest. It thus blends the knowledge elements of history with the imaginative power of romance (B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis).

The study of Geography can be made more interesting than it sometimes actually is by utilizing such a book as *Real Stories of the Geography Makers,* by John T. Faris (Ginn & Co., Boston). Atlas and wall map charts suggest to the pupil the names of the intrepid explorers who "put the countries on the map", and the accounts of the hardships and courage of these undaunted voyagers cannot but be a source of worth-while geographical and historical information as well as an incentive to dare and to brave. The book is well illustrated and documented. The author, however, seems unaware of the existence of a New School of American History. Had he known of *The Spanish Pioneers* by that fearlessly just historian, Charles Lummis (seventh edition: Chicago: McClurg & Co.), he would hardly have appealed to Prescott's *Conquest of Peru*

for the history of Pizarro, "the cruel man," who, he says, "looted Peru without pity". Here is what Lummis has to say of the much maligned conquistador: "Pizzaro has been long misrepresented as a blood-stained and cruel conqueror, a selfish, unprincipled, unreliable man; but in the clear, true light of real history he stands forth as one of the greatest of self-made men. . . . The conquest of Peru did not by far cause as much bloodshed as the final reduction of the Indian tribes of Virginia. It counted scarcely as many Indian victims as King Philip's War and was much less bloody because more straightforward and honorable, than any of the British conquests in East India. The most bloody events in Peru came after the conquest was over, when the Spaniards fell to fighting one another; and in this Pizzaro was not the aggressor but the victim. . . . His conquest covered a land as big as California, Oregon, and most of Washington—or as our own seaboard from Nova Scotia to Port Royal and two hundred miles inland—swarming with the best organized and most advanced Indians in the Western Hemisphere; and he did it all with less than three hundred gaunt and tattered men . . . " (*S. P.*, p. 69). We give this characterization of Pizzaro by Lummis—who above all things loves a square deal—because so many are infected by ideas derived from Prescott's romantic story of the Conquest.

America's lads and lassies ought to grow up robust and leal, seeing that they have such helps as *The Practical Health Series* issued by Ginn & Co. Two numbers have reached us, *Health and Success* and *Health and Good Citizenship*. These books are compiled by expert authorities and contain a wonderful amount of information and advice concerning the body and its proper care—how to keep it strong and invigorate it if weakened. Our teachers will find these books serviceable in the school, as will parents in the home. Even the clergy may find them suggestive.

How many Catholics are there in the United States? According to the *Official Catholic Directory* (P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York) the number is 18,654,028. That is the total of the figures furnished by the diocesan authorities. For some dioceses, however, the statistics have been stationary for many years, and one may well take the estimate made by J. H. Meier—20,738,447—as more nearly correct.

In arriving at his total, Mr. Meier, who was editor of the *Official Catholic Directory* for several years, and who has made a thorough study of our Catholic statistics, takes into account those who are not checked up by the census-taker either because of their moving from place to place or for divers other reasons. If these "floating" or otherwise unenrolled Catholics were counted in, it is conservatively estimated that they would add two million more to our Catholic population figures.

Books Received

SCRIPTURAL.

THESES PAULINAE. Excerpta e Commentariis *Verbum Domini*. Auctore C. Lattey, S.J. Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico. 1925.

IL LIBRO DI GIOBBE. Versione critica dal testo ebraico con Introduzione e Commento. Giuseppe Ricciotti, Canonico Regolare Lateranense. Torino e Roma: Casa Editrice Marietti. 1924. Pp. xii-250. Prezzo, 25 *L.*

LE LAMENTAZIONI DI GEREMIA. Versione critica dal testo ebraico con Introduzione e Commento. Giuseppe Ricciotti, Canonico Regolare Lateranense. Torino e Roma: Pietro Marietti. 1924. Pp. viii-101. Prezzo, 12 *L.*

THEOLOGICAL AND DEVOTIONAL.

MANUAL OF MORAL THEOLOGY. For English-Speaking Countries. By the Rev. Thomas Slater, S.J. Vol. I. Fifth and revised edition. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1925. Pp. xii-367. Price, $4.50 *net* per vol.

THE CROWDS OF LOURDES. By J. K. Huysmans. Translated by W. H. Mitchell. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1925. Pp. xi-260. Price, $2.25 *net*.

A ROSE WREATH FOR THE CROWNING OF ST. THERESE OF THE CHILD JESUS, "The Little Sister of Missionaries". By the Rev. John P. Clarke, author of *Her Little Way*. Preface by the Rev. Hugh F. Blunt, LL.D. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1925. Pp. 103. Price, $1.10 *postpaid*.

LE SANG DES PRETRES. Par Henry Bordeaux, de l'Académie Française. Bonne Presse, Paris. 1925. Pp. 78. Prix, 2 *fr.* 15 *franco*.

UNE VIERGE FRANCAISE. Emilie de Vialar, Fondatrice des Religieuses Saint-Joseph de l'Apparition. Par M l'Abbé Louis Picard, Chanoine titulaire de la Primatiale de Lyon. Avec une lettre d'approbation de S. Em. le Cardinal Maurin. Préface de Mgr. Lavallée, Recteur des Facultès Catholiques de Lyon. Bonne Presse, Paris. 1924. Pp. xv-341. Prix, 7 *fr.* 75 *franco*.

LE SAINT ROSAIRE. Nouveau Directoire canonique de la Confrérie. Par le R. P. Vincent Mercier, des Frères Prêcheurs. Bonne Press, Paris. 1924. Pp. 104. Prix, 1 *fr.* 95 *franco*.

THE STORY OF THE LITTLE FLOWER OF JESUS. By the Rev. Daniel A. Lord, S.J., author of *Our Nuns* and *Six One-Act Plays*. With decorative drawings by the Rev. Louis B. Egan, S.J. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1925. Pp. 45. Price, $0.15.

ZU DEN FUESSEN DES MEISTERS. Kurze Betrachtungen für vielbeschäftige Priester. Von Anton Huonder, S.J. Band II: Die Liedensnacht. B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, Freiburg, Brisg., und London. 1925. S. 429. Preis $1.50.

PHILOSOPHICAL.

OUR MODERN CHAOS AND THE WAY OUT. By Ernest R. Hull, S.J. Examiner Press, Bombay; P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York; B. Herder Book Co., London and St. Louis. Pp. 80.

TRAITÉ DE PHILOSOPHIE. Par Gaston Sortais, S.J., ancien Professeur de Philosophie. Tome Premier: Introduction — Psychologie — Logique. 1923. Tome Second: Morale—Esthétique—Métaphysique—Vocabulaire Philosophique. 1924. Cinquième édition, revue et augmentée. P. Lethielleux, Paris. Pp. xxxii-876 et xvi-981. Prix, les deux volumes, 70 *fr. franco*.

FAMILIEN- UND ANSTALTSERZIEHUNG IN DER JUGENDFÜRSORGE. Eine grundsätzliche und entwicklungsgeschichtliche social-ethische Untersuchung. Von Dr. Theol. Joseph Beeking. B. Herder Book Co., Freiburg, Brisg.; St. Louis and London. 1925. S. 276. Preis, $2.00.

SANCTI AMBROSII ORATIO DE OBITU THEODOSII. Text, Translation, Introduction and Commentary. Dissertation submitted to Catholic Sisters College of Catholic University of America in partial fulfillment of requirements for Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. By Sister Mary Dolorosa Mannix, M.A., of Sisters of St. Joseph of Carondelet. (*Patristic Studies*, Vol. IX.) Catholic University, Washington, D. C. 1925. Pp. xv-166.

WHAT BECOMES OF THE DEAD? Study in Eschatology for Priests and Laymen. By J. P. Arendzen, Ph.D., D.D., author of *The Gospel—Fact, Myth, or Legend?* Sands & Co., London and Edinburgh; B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis. Pp. 287. Price, $1.80.

APOLOGETIQUE. Par Eugène Duplessy, Chanoine de Notre-Dame de Paris. Livre III: Démonstration du Catholicisme. Bonne Presse, Paris. 1924. Pp. 516. Prix, trois vol., 7 *fr.* 45 *franco.*

CASE AGAINST EVOLUTION. By George Barry O'Toole, Ph.D., S.T.D., Professor of Theology and Professor Emeritus of Philosophy, St. Vincent Archabbey; Professor of Animal Biology, Seton Hall College. Macmillan Co., New York. 1925. Pp. xiv-408. Price, $3.50.

LITURGICAL.

THE LITURGY IN ROME. Feasts and Functions of the Church. The Ceremonies of Holy Week. By M. A. R. Tuker. New and revised edition with Appendix. (*Handbook to Christian and Ecclesiastical Rome.* By M. A. R. Tuker and Hope Malleson.) A. &. C. Black, London. 1925. Pp. viii-324.

LA LITURGIE ROMAINE. Liturgie Primitive et Grand Hallel. Liturgie Romaine Greque. Liturgie Romano-Africaine. Liturgie Romaine Latine. Par le R. P. J.-B. Thibaut, des Augustins de l'Assomption. Bonne Presse, Paris. 1924. Pp. 125. Prix, 5 *fr.* 45 *franco.*

LE SERVANT DE LA MESSE BASSE. Par C. A. (*Editions du "Sanctuaire".*) Bonne Presse, Paris. 1925. Pp. 111. Prix, 2 *fr.* 15 *franco.*

O SACRED HEART, BY SINNERS SO FORSAKEN! Hymn to Sacred Heart. Music by the Rev. Patrick Walsh. Rogers Church Goods Co., Louisville, Ky. 1925. Pp. 3.

LITURGICAE INSTITUTIONES. Tractatus Primus: De S. Liturgia Universim. Auctore C. Callewaert, J.C.D., Eccl. Cathedr. Brugensis Canonico Theologali, Seminarii Brugensis Praeside ac Liturgiae Professore, et in Universitate Lovaniensi olim Lectore. Editio altera auctior atque emendatior. Apud Carolum Beyaert, Brugis, Belgii. 1925. Pp. viii-168. Pretio, 12 *fr.*

ROMAN JUBILEE. History and Ceremonial of "Holy Year of Jubilee". By Herbert Thurston, S.J. Illustrated. Sands & Co., London and Edinburgh; B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis. Pp. 206. Price, $2.25.

HISTORICAL.

INTRODUCTION TO CHURCH HISTORY. For Beginners. By the Rev. Peter Guilday, Ph.D., President, American Catholic Historical Society, etc. B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis and London. 1925. Pp. 350. Price, $2.00.

TEACHING OF MARY AIKENHEAD. Selections from *Life and Work.* By a Member of Her Congregation. With extracts from letters of Father Robert St. Leger, S.J. Longmans, Green & Co., London, New York, Toronto, Bombay, Calcutta and Madras. 1925. Pp. viii-156. Price, $1.00 (3/-) *net.*

LIFE AND LETTERS OF BISHOP MCQUAID. Prefaced with History of Catholic Rochester before His Episcopate. By Frederick J. Zwierlein, D.Sc.M.H. (Louvain), author of *Religion in New Netherland.* Vol. I. (Université de Louvain. *Recueil de Travaux* publiés par les membres des Conférences d'Histoire et de Philologie. 2me série, 6me fascicule.) Art Print Shop, Rochester; Desclée & Co., Rome; A. Uytspruyst, Louvain. 1925. Pp. xii-368.

CHRISTIAN MONASTICISM. A Great Force in History. By Ian C. Hannah, F.S.A., Professor of Church History, Oberlin College. Macmillan Co., New York. 1925. Pp. 270.

EIGHTEENTH CENTURY STUDIES AND OTHER PAPERS. By Robert Bracey, O.P. Foreword by Bishop of Clifton. D. Appleton & Co., New York. 1925. Pp. 142.

HISTORY OF GERMAN PEOPLE AFTER CLOSE OF MIDDLE AGES. By Johannes Janssen. Index Volume. Kegan Paul, Trench, Truebner & Co., London; B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis. 1925. Pp. 434. Price, $5.50.

MISCELLANEOUS.

BY WHAT AUTHORITY? By Robert Hugh Benson, author of *Come Rack! Come Rope!* etc. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. 1925. Pp. viii-499. Price, $1.35 *postpaid.*

ROMFAHRT. Kurzer kunst-geschichtlicher Führer durch die Ewige Stadt. Von Hermann Otto Fichtner. Mit Plan und Bildern. Joseph Kösel und Friedrich Pustet, K. G., München und Regensburg. 1925. S. 215. Preis, $0.75.

PLANE GEOMETRY. By Royal A. Avery, Ph.B., North High School, Syracuse, N. Y. Allyn & Bacon, Boston. 1925. Pp. xxvi-319. Price, $1.25.

KIDNAPPED. By Robert Louis Stevenson. Edited with Biography, Notes and Questions by A. B. de Mille, Simmons College, Boston; Secretary of New England Association of Teachers of English. Allyn & Bacon, Boston. 1925. Pp. ix-327. Price, $0.80.

GENERAL SCIENCE. By William H. Snyder, Sc.D., Principal of Hollywood High School, Los Angeles. Allyn & Bacon, Boston. 1925. Pp. xviii-608. Price, $1.60.

THE HOUSE WITH DUMMY WINDOWS AND OTHER STORIES. By a Nun of Tyburn Convent, author of *The Story of Blessed Thomas More,* etc. Sands & Co., London and Edinburgh; B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis and London. 1925. Pp. 192. Price, $1.40.

GRANNIE'S STORY CUPBOARD. A Nightcap for Little Hearts and Little Heads. By a Religious of the Holy Child Jesus. Illustrated by Peter C. Miller. Sands & Co., London and Edinburgh; B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis and London. 1925. Pp. 159. Price, $1.35.

SA MAJESTE LA MODE! Par Pierre l'Ermite. Tract, série B. Bonne Presse, Paris. 1925. Pp. 2. Prix, *franco:* la douzaine, o *fr.* 65; le cent, 4 *fr.* 10.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF OLD BREVIARY. Edited by the Rev. Herman J. Heuser, D.D. With Glossary and Index. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1925. Pp. 238. Price, **$1.75** ***net.***

HEALTH AND SUCCESS. By J. Mace Andress, Ph.D., Lecturer on Health Education, Boston University, and W. A. Evans, M.D., Professor of Public Health, Medical School of Northwestern University, former President of American Public Health Association and former Health Commissioner of Chicago. (*Practical Health Series,* Book 1.) Ginn & Co., Boston. 1925. Price, $0.76.

WAYS TO BETTER ENGLISH. Enlarged Course. By Thomas H. Briggs, Teachers College, Columbia University, and Isabel McKinney, Eastern Illinois State Teachers College. Ginn & Co., Boston. 1924. Pp. vii-416. Price, $1.36.

HEALTH AND GOOD CITIZENSHIP. By J. Mace Andress, Ph.D., and W. A. Evans, M.D. (*Practical Health Series,* Book 2.) Ginn & Co., Boston. 1925. Pp. viii-376. Price, $0.96.

BOOK OF LATIN POETRY. Selections from Naevius to Hymn-Writers. Chosen and annotated by John Basore, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Classics, Princeton University, and Shirley H. Weber, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Classics, Princeton University. Allyn & Bacon, Boston, New York, Chicago, Atlanta and San Francisco. 1925. Pp. xx-346. Price, $1.80.

EVERYMAN and SECOND SHEPHERDS' PLAY. Acting Versions. By William R. Duffey, Professor of Speech and Dramatic Art in Marquette University. Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee. 1925. Pp. 88. Price, $0.50.

SIX ONE-ACT PLAYS. By Daniel A. Lord, S.J., author of *Our Nuns,* etc. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1925. Pp. 175. Price, $1.75 ***net.***